
Volume XXVIII

OCTOBER 1942

Number 4

Bulletin
of
The American Association
of
University Professors

Editor

Ralph E. Himstead

Editorial Committee

Robert P. Ludlum

E. C. Kirkland
Richard J. Purcell

Louise Pound

Publication Office: 20th and Northampton Sts., Easton, Pa.

Editorial Office: 1155 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Issued bimonthly in February, April, June, October, and December. Subscription price (due and payable in advance) is \$3.00 a year, postage free. Foreign subscriptions (including Canada) are \$3.50 a year.

Entered as second-class matter, April 24, 1922, at the Post Office at Easton, Pa., under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on September 13, 1918.

OFFICERS AND THE COUNCIL

PRESIDENT

W. T. LAPRADE (*History*) Duke University

FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER (*French Literature*) Johns Hopkins University

SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT

ZECHARIAH CHAFFE, JR. (*Law*) Harvard University

GENERAL SECRETARY

RALPH E. HIMSTAD (*Law*) Washington Office

ASSOCIATE SECRETARY

ROBERT P. LUDLUM (*History*) Washington Office

TREASURER

FLORENCE P. LEWIS (*Mathematics*) Goucher College

TERM MEMBERS

1940-1942

FRANK L. GRIFFIN (<i>Mathematics</i>)	Reed College
FOWLER V. HARPER (<i>Law</i>)	Indiana University
HELEN SARD HUGHES (<i>English</i>)	Wellesley College
JOHN ISE (<i>Economics</i>)	University of Kansas
G. W. MARTIN (<i>Botany</i>)	State University of Iowa
ROY F. NICHOLS (<i>History</i>)	University of Pennsylvania
H. L. OSTERUD (<i>Anatomy</i>)	Medical College of Virginia
HARALD S. PATTON (<i>Economics</i>)	Michigan State College
HORATIO SMITH (<i>French</i>)	Columbia University
MARIE J. WEISS (<i>Mathematics</i>)	Tulane University of Louisiana

1941-1943

WILLIAM A. BROWNELL (<i>Educational Psychology</i>)	Duke University
JEWELL HUGHES BUSHEY (<i>Mathematics</i>)	Hunter College
CHARLOTTE D'EVELYN (<i>English</i>)	Mount Holyoke College
CHARLES L. JAMISON (<i>Business Administration</i>)	University of Michigan
JOHN A. KINNEMAN (<i>Sociology</i>)	Illinois State Normal University
ETHEL SABIN-SMITH (<i>Psychology, Philosophy</i>)	Mills College
STANLEY S. SWARTLEY (<i>English</i>)	Allegheny College
JOHN A. VIEG (<i>Government</i>)	Iowa State College
PAUL W. WARD (<i>Philosophy</i>)	Syracuse University
E. J. WORKMAN (<i>Physics</i>)	University of New Mexico

1942-1944

C. RAYMOND ADAMS (<i>Mathematics</i>)	Brown University
M. M. BOBER (<i>Economics</i>)	Lawrence College
WALTHER I. BRANDT (<i>History</i>)	The City College (New York)
EUGENE PARKER CHASE (<i>Political Science</i>)	Lafayette College
H. G. DEMING (<i>Chemistry</i>)	University of Nebraska
RUSSELL PARSONS JAMESON (<i>Romance Languages</i>)	Oberlin College
A. LADRU JENSEN (<i>Law</i>)	University of Utah
*ARTHUR L. KEITH (<i>Latin</i>)	University of South Dakota
GEORGE POPE SHANNON (<i>English</i>)	University of Alabama
A. CURTIS WILGUS (<i>Hispanic American History</i>)	George Washington University

EX-PRESIDENTS

A. J. CARLSON (<i>Physiology</i>)	University of Chicago
MARK H. INGRAHAM (<i>Mathematics</i>)	University of Wisconsin
FREDERICK S. DEIBLER (<i>Economics</i>)	Northwestern University
* Deceased.	

CONTENTS

THE FOUR FREEDOMS, Statement by the Office of War Information.....	437
POLITICS AND HIGHER EDUCATION IN NEW MEXICO, <i>William H. Edwards</i>	452
IF YOU WANT TO RISE TO THE TOP OF THE TREE, <i>Meribeth E. Cameron</i>	465
THE EDUCATIONAL MEANING OF MORALE, <i>Carroll D. Champlin</i>	473
THE UNDERGRADUATE IN THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY, <i>John J. Lund</i>	480
APPRAISING ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE, <i>Howard Dykema Roelofs</i>	489
AN ADVENTURE IN COLLEGE GOVERNMENT, <i>Harold A. Larrabee</i>	494
PROBLEMS OF THE PROFESSORiate, <i>Ralph E. Himstead</i>	498
ASSOCIATION NEWS	
Twenty-ninth Annual Meeting.....	505
The Associate Secretaryship.....	507
Regional Meetings.....	508
Chapter Activities.....	509
REPORT OF THE 1942 NOMINATING COMMITTEE.....	510
REPORT OF COMMITTEE O ON ORGANIZATION AND POLICY...	517
CONTRIBUTORS.....	525
COMMUNICATIONS.....	526
REVIEWS	
A Short History of Canada for Americans, <i>Alfred LeRoy Burt</i>	533
The Academic Man, <i>Logan Wilson</i>	535
Education in a Democracy, edited by <i>Newton Edwards</i> ...	540
EDITORIAL, The Special Significance of Association Membership in Wartime, <i>W. T. Laprade</i> and <i>Ralph E. Himstead</i>	552
CENSURED ADMINISTRATIONS.....	556
MEMBERSHIP.....	557
ACADEMIC VACANCIES AND TEACHERS AVAILABLE.....	562

Contents of previous issues of the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors may be found by consulting the EDUCATIONAL INDEX.

The four freedoms of common humanity are as much elements of man's needs as air and sunlight, bread and salt. Deprive him of all these freedoms and he dies—deprive him of a part of them and a part of him withers. Give them to him in full and abundant measure and he will cross the threshold of a new age, the greatest age of man.

These freedoms are the rights of men of every creed and every race, wherever they live. This is their heritage, long withheld. We of the United Nations have the power and the men and the will at last to assure man's heritage.

The belief in the four freedoms of common humanity—the belief in man, created free, in the image of God—is the crucial difference between ourselves and the enemies we face today. In it lies the absolute unity of our alliance, opposed to the oneness of the evil we hate. Here is our strength, the source and promise of victory.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

THE FOUR FREEDOMS

STATEMENT BY THE OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION¹

Beyond the war lies the peace. Both sides have sketched the outlines of the new world toward which they strain. The leaders of the Axis countries have published their design for all to read. They promise a world in which the conquered peoples will live out their lives in the service of their masters.

The United Nations, now engaged in a common cause, have also published their design, and have committed certain common aims to writing. They plan a world in which men stand straight and walk free, free not of all human trouble but free of the fear of despotic power, free to develop as individuals, free to conduct and shape their affairs. Such a world has been more dream than reality, more hope than fact; but it has been the best hope men have had and the one for which they have most consistently shown themselves willing to die.

This free-ness, this liberty, this precious thing men love and mean to save, is the good granite ledge on which the United Nations now propose to raise their new world after victory. The purpose of this pamphlet is to examine and define the essential freedoms.

To talk of war aims, shouting over the din of battle while the planet rocks and vibrates, may seem futile to some. Yet the talk must go on among free peoples. The faith people have in themselves is what the free have to build upon. Such faith is basic to them—man's hot belief in man, a belief which suggests that human beings are capable of ordering their affairs. This is a high compliment paid by man to himself, an evidence or gesture of self-respect, of stature, of dignity, and of worth, an affidavit of individual responsibility.

The freedoms we are fighting for, we who are free: the freedoms for which the men and women in the concentration camps and

¹ Released August 9, 1942.

prisons and in the dark streets of the subjugated countries wait, are four in number.

The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world.

The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world.

The third is freedom from want—which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants—everywhere in the world.

The fourth is freedom from fear—which, translated into world terms, means a world-wide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor—anywhere in the world.¹

These freedoms are separate, but not independent. Each one relies upon all the others. Each supports the whole, which is liberty. When one is missing, all the others are jeopardized. A person who lives under a tyrant, and has lost freedom of speech, must necessarily be tortured by fear. A person who is in great want is usually also in great fear—fear of even direr want and greater insecurity. A person denied the right to worship in his own way has thereby lost the knack of free speech, for unless he is free to exercise his religious conscience, his privilege of free speech (even though not specifically denied) is meaningless. A person tortured with fears has lost both the privilege of free speech and the strength to supply himself with his needs. Clearly these four freedoms are as closely related, as dependent one upon another, as the four seasons of the natural year, whose winter snows irrigate the spring, and whose dead leaves, fermenting, rebuild the soil for summer's yield.

The first two freedoms—freedom of speech and freedom of religion—are cultural. They are prerogatives of the thinking man, of the creative and civilized human being. Sometimes, as in the United States, they are guaranteed by organic law. They are rather clearly understood, and the laws protecting them are continually being revised and adjusted to preserve their basic

¹ Franklin D. Roosevelt to the Seventy-seventh Congress, January 6, 1941.

meaning. Freedom from fear and from want, on the other hand, are not part of our culture but part of our environment—they concern the facts of our lives rather than the thoughts of our minds. Men are unafraid, or well fed, or both, according to the conditions under which they live.

To be free a man must live in a society which has relieved those curious pressures which conspire to make men slaves: pressure of a despotic government, pressure of intolerance, pressure of want. The declaration of the four freedoms, therefore, is not a promise of a gift which, under certain conditions, the people will receive; it is a declaration of a design which the people themselves may execute.

Freedom, of whatever sort, is relative. Nations united by a common effort to create a better world are obviously not projecting a Utopia in which nobody shall want for anything. That is not the point—nor within the range of human possibility. What unites them is the purpose to create a world in which no one need want for the minimum necessities of an orderly and decent life, for cleanliness, for self-respect and security. It is an ambitious design, perhaps too ambitious for the cynic or the faithless; but it is supported by the sure knowledge that the earth produces abundantly and that men are already in possession of the tools which could realize such a purpose if men chose to use them.

This, then, is a credo to which the representatives of twenty-eight nations have subscribed—not a promise made by any group of men to any other group. It is only the people themselves who can create the conditions favoring these essential freedoms which they are now repurchasing in the bazaar of war and paying for with their lives. Nothing is for sale at bargain prices, nor will the house be built in three days with cheap labor. From a world in ruins there can rise only a slow, deliberate monument. This time, conceived by so many peoples of united purpose, it will rise straight upward and rest on good support.

Freedom of Speech

To live free a man must speak openly: gag him and he becomes either servile or full of cankers. Free government is then the most realistic kind of government for it not only assumes that a

man has something on his mind, but concedes his right to say it. It permits him to talk—not without fear of contradiction, but without fear of punishment.

There can be no people's rule unless there is talk. Men, it turns out, breathe through their minds as well as through their lungs, and there must be a circulation of ideas as well as of air. Since nothing is likely to be more distasteful to a man than the opinion of someone who disagrees with him, it does the race credit that it has so stubbornly defended the principle of free speech. But if a man knows anything at all, he knows that that principle is fundamental in self-government, the whole purpose of which is to reflect and affirm the will of the people.

In America, free speech and a free press were the first things the minds of the people turned to after the fashioning of the Constitution. Farsighted men, in those early days, readily understood that some sort of protection was necessary. Thus when the first amendment to the Constitution was drawn (part of what the world now knows as the Bill of Rights), it prohibited the Congress from making any law which might abridge the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of their grievances.

In the Nazi state, freedom of speech and expression have been discarded—not for temporary military expediency, but as a principle of life. Being contemptuous of the individual, and secretly suspicious of him, the German leader has deprived him of his voice. Ideas are what tyrants most fear. To set up a despotic state, the first step is to get rid of the talkers—the talkers in schools, the talkers in forums, the talkers in political rallies and in trade union meetings, the talkers on the radio and in the news-reels, and in the barber shops and village garages. Talk does not fit the Nazi and the Fascist scheme, where all ideas are, by the very nature of the political structure, the property of one man.

Talk is death to tyranny, for it can easily clarify a political position which the ruler may prefer to becloud, and it can expose injustices which he may choose to obscure.

Our Bill of Rights specifically mentioned the press. Today the press is one of many forms of utterance. Talk and ideas

flow in ever-increasing torrents, through books, magazines, schools, the radio, the motion picture. The camera has created a whole new language of its own.

All these new forms are safeguarded with the ancient guarantees, but the essential danger of not being allowed to speak freely remains. Today the privilege is challenged more gravely than ever before; in the countries dominated by the Axis books are burned, universities are shut down, men are put to death for listening to a radio broadcast. Hitler's New Order seeks to prove that unity and efficiency are achieved most readily among people who are prevented from reading, thinking, talking, debating. This new anesthesia is a subtle drug. Under its quick influence men sleep a strange sleep.

The right to speak, the right to hear, the right of access to information carry with them certain responsibilities. Certain favorable conditions are necessary before freedom of speech acquires validity.

The first condition is that the individual have something to say. Literacy is a prerequisite of free speech, and gives it point. Denied education, denied information, suppressed or enslaved, people grow sluggish; their opinions are hardly worth the high privilege of release. Similarly, those who live in terror or in destitution, even though no specific control is placed upon their speech, are as good as gagged.

Another condition necessary for free speech is that the people have access to the means of uttering it—to newspapers, to the radio, the public forum. When power and capital are concentrated, when the press is too closely the property of narrow interests, then freedom suffers. There is no freedom, either, unless facts are within reach, unless information is made available. And a final condition of free speech is that there be no penalties attached to the spread of information and to the expression of opinion, whether those penalties be applied by the Government or by any private interests whatsoever.

The operation of a free press and the free expression of opinion are far from absolute rights. The laws of libel and slander set limits on what men may say of other men. The exigency of war sets limits on what information may be given out, lest it give

aid and comfort to the enemy. Good taste sets limits on all speech.

Freedom of speech, Justice Holmes has warned, does not grant the right to shout fire in a crowded theater. When ideas become overt acts against peace and order, then the Government presumes to interfere with free speech. The burden of proof, however, is upon those who would restrict speech—the danger must be not some vague danger but real and immediate.

We are not so much concerned with these inevitable limitations to free speech as with the delight at the principle in society and how greatly it has strengthened man's spirit, how steadily it has enlarged his culture and his world. We in America know what the privilege is because we have lived with it for a century and a half. Talk founded the Union, nurtured it, and preserved it. The dissenter, the disbeliever, the crack-pot, the reformer, those who would pull down as well as build up—all are free to have their say.

Talk is our daily fare—the white-bosomed lecturer regaling the Tuesday Ladies' Club, the prisoner at the bar testifying in his own behalf, the editorial writer complaining of civic abuses, the actor declaiming behind the footlights, the movie star speaking on the screen, the librarian dispensing the accumulated talk of ages, the professor holding forth to his students, the debating society, the meeting of the aldermen, the minister in the pulpit, the traveler in the smoking car, the soap-box orator with his flag and his bundle of epigrams, the opinions of the solemn magistrate and the opinions of the animated mouse—words, ideas, in a never-ending stream, from the enduring wisdom of the great and the good to the puniest thought troubling the feeblest brain. All are listened to, all add up to something and we call it the rule of the people, the people who are free to say the words.

The United States fights to preserve this heritage, which is the very essence of the Four Freedoms. How, unless there is freedom of speech, can freedom of religion or freedom from want or freedom from fear be realized? The enemies of all liberty flourish and grow strong in the dark of enforced silence.

For the right to be articulate the inarticulate airman climbs to his fabulous battleground. For this fight the grim-lipped soldier; the close-mouthed sailor; the marine.

Freedom of Religion

That part of man which is called the spirit and which belongs only to himself and to his God, is of the very first concern in designing a free world. It was not their stomachs but their immortal souls which brought the first settlers to America's shores, and they prayed before they ate. Freedom of conscience, the right to worship God, is part of our soil and of the sky above this continent.

Freedom of worship implies that the individual has a source of moral values which transcends the immediate necessities of the community, however important these may be. It is one thing to pay taxes to the state—this men will do; it is another to submit their consciences to the state—this they politely decline. The wise community respects this mysterious quality in the individual, and makes its plans accordingly.

The democratic guarantee of freedom of worship is not in the nature of a grant—it is in the nature of an admission. It is the state admitting that the spirit soars in illimitable regions beyond the collectors of customs. It was Tom Paine, one of the great voices of freedom in early America, who pointed out that a government could no more grant to man the liberty to worship God than it could grant to God the liberty of receiving such worship.

The miracle which democracy has achieved is that while practicing many kinds of worship, we nevertheless achieve social unity and peace. And so we have the impressive spectacle, which is with us always here in America, of men attending many different churches, but the same town meeting, the same political forum.

Opposed to this democratic conception of man and of the human spirit is the totalitarian conception. The Axis powers pretend that they own all of a man, including his conscience. It was inevitable that the Nazis should try to deny the Christian church, because in virtually every respect its teachings are in opposition to the Nazi ideal of race supremacy and of the subordination of the individual. Christianity could only be an annoyance and a threat to Hitler's bid for power and his contempt for the common man.

Today the struggle of Man's spirit is against new and curious shackles. Today a new monstrosity has shown itself on earth, a seven days' wonder, a new child of tyranny—a political religion in

which the leader of the state becomes, himself, an object of worship and reverence and in which the individual becomes a corpuscle in the blood of the community, almost without identity. This Nazi freak must fail, if only because men are not clods, because the spirit does live. In the design for a new and better world, religious freedom is a fundamental prop.

We of the nations united in war, among whom all the great religions are represented, see a triumphant peace by which all races will continue the belief in man, the belief in his elusive and untouchable spirit, and in the solid worth of human life.

Freedom from Want

The proposal that want be abolished from this world would be pretentious, or even ridiculous, were it not for two important recent discoveries.

One is the discovery that, beyond any doubt, men now possess the technical ability to produce in great abundance the necessities of daily life—enough for everyone. This is a revolutionary and quite unprecedented condition on earth, which stimulates the imagination and quickens the blood.

Another is the discovery (or rather the realization) that the earth is one planet indivisible—that one man's hunger is every other man's hunger. We know now that the world must be looked at whole if men are to enjoy the fruits they are now able to produce, and if the inhabitants of the globe are to survive and prosper.

Freedom from want, everywhere in the world, is within the grasp of men. It has never been quite within their grasp before. Prosperous times have been enjoyed in certain regions of the world at certain periods in history, but local prosperity was usually achieved at the expense of some other region, which was being impoverished, and the spectre of impending war hung over all. Now, the industrial changes of the last 150 years and the new prospect implicit in the words "United Nations" have given meaning to the phrase "freedom from want" and rendered it not only possible but necessary.

It was in the year 1492 that the earth became round in the minds of men—although it had been privately globular for many cen-

turies. Now in the year 1942, by a coincidence which should fortify astrologers, the earth's rotundity again opens new vistas, this time not of fabulous continents ready to be ransacked, but of a fabulous world ready to be unified and restored. War having achieved totality, against men's wishes but with their full participation, our great resolve as we go to battle must now be that the peace shall be total also. The world is all one today. No military gesture anywhere on earth, however trivial, has been without consequence everywhere; and what is true of the military is true, also, of the economic. A hungry man in Cambodia is a threat to the well fed of Duluth.

People are worried about the period which will follow this war. Some fear the peace more than they fear the war. But the picture is neither hopeless nor is it black. Already, in this country and abroad, agencies are at work making preliminary studies and designing machinery to stabilize the peacetime world which will follow the war. They are preparing to re-employ the returning soldier, to maintain buying power at a high level, to stand behind industry while it is changing back to peaceable products, to guarantee a certain security to the groups which need such guarantees. The fact that these plans are being drawn is itself encouraging, for when trouble is anticipated and fairly faced, it is less likely to ensue.

The tools of production and the skills which men possess are tremendous in the present war emergency, and when the peace comes, the world will contain more skilled people than ever before in history. Those who are at work planning broadly for a better human society propose to equip this enormous productive manpower with new ideas to fit new conditions.

The pattern is already beginning to become apparent. Once, the soil was regarded as something to use and get the most from and then abandon. Now it is something to conserve and replenish. Once it was enough that a man compete freely in business, for the greatest possible personal gain; now his enterprise, still free, must meet social standards and must not tend toward concentration of power unfavorable to the general well-being of the community. Once, an idle man was presumed to be a loafer; now it is realized he may be a victim of circumstances in which all share, and for which all are responsible.

The great civilizations of the past were never free from widespread poverty. Very few of them, and these only during short periods, produced enough wealth to make possible a decent living standard for all their members, even if that wealth had been equally divided. In the short space of a few decades we have changed scarcity to abundance and are now engaged in the experiment of trying to live with our new and as yet unmanageable riches. The problem becomes one not of production but of distribution and of consumption; and since buying power must be earned, freedom from want becomes freedom from mass unemployment, plus freedom from penury for those individuals unable to work.

In our United States the Federal Government, being the common meeting ground of all interests and the final agency of the people, assumes a certain responsibility for the solution of economic problems. This is not a new rôle for the Government, which has been engaged since the earliest days of our history in devising laws and machinery and techniques for promoting the well-being of the citizen, whether he was a soldier returning from a war, or a new settler heading west to seek his fortune, or a manufacturer looking for a market for his goods, or a farmer puzzled over a problem in animal husbandry.

The beginning has been made. The right to work. The right to fair pay. The right to adequate food, clothing, shelter, medical care. The right to security. The right to live in an atmosphere of free enterprise. We state these things as "rights"—not because man has any natural right to be nourished and sheltered, not because the world owes any man a living, but because unless man succeeds in filling these primary needs his only development is backward and downward, his only growth malignant, and his last resource war.

All of these opportunities are not in the American record yet, and they are not yet in the world's portfolio in the shape of blueprints. Much of America and most of the world are not properly fed, clothed, housed. But there has never been a time, since the world began, when the hope of providing the essentials of life to every living man and woman and child has been so good, or when the necessity has been so great.

It can be done. The wealth exists in the earth, the power exists in the hills, men have the tools and the training. What remains to be seen is whether they have the wit and the moral character to work together and to lay aside their personal greed.

We and our allies are fighting today not merely to defend an honorable past and old slogans and faiths, but to construct a still more honorable and rewarding future. Fighting men, coming back from the war, will not be satisfied with a mere guarantee of dull security—they will expect to find useful work and a vigorous life. Already moves are being made to meet this inescapable challenge.

The first step, obviously, will be to prevent the sort of slump which has usually followed a great war. War is tremendously costly, in terms of money. Billions are being spent in order that we may win. The peace, too, will be costly, and nothing is gained by evading the fact. But a democracy which can organize itself to defeat one sort of enemy is capable of sustaining the effort through the days that follow. Work, in vast quantity and in infinite variety, will be waiting to be done. We will have the capacity to produce the highest national income ever known, and the jobs to keep men at work.

Freedom from want is neither a conjurer's trick nor a madman's dream. The earth has never known it, nor anything approaching it. But free men do not accept the defeatist notion that it never will. The freeing of all people from want is a continuing experiment, the oldest and most absorbing one in the laboratory, the one that has produced the strangest gases and the loudest explosions. It is a people's own experiment and goes on through the courtesy of chemists and physicists and poets and technicians and men of strong faith and unshakable resolve.

Freedom from Fear

Fear is the inheritance of every animal, and man is no exception. Our children fear the tangible dark, and we give them what reassurance we can, so that they will grow and develop normally, their minds free from imaginary terrors. This reassurance, this sense of protection and security, is an important factor in their lives.

The new dark which has settled on the earth with the coming of might and force and evil has terrified grown men and women. They fear the dark, fear fire and the sword; they are tormented by the dread of evils which are only too real. They fear the conqueror who places his shackles on the mind. Above all else they are tortured by that basic political fear: fear of domination of themselves by others—others who are stronger, others who are advancing, others who have the weapons and are destroying and burning and pillaging. This is the fear which haunts millions of men and women everywhere in the world. It is the fear of being awakened in the night, with the rapping on the door.

No structure of peace, no design for a good world, will have any solidity or strength or even any meaning unless it disperses the shadow of this fear and brings reassurance to men and women, not only for themselves but for their children and their children's children. Aggressive war, sudden armed attack, secret police, these must be forever circumvented. The use of force, historically the means of settling disputes, must be made less and less feasible on earth, until it finally becomes impossible. Even though the underlying causes which foment wars may not be immediately eradicated from the earth, the physical act of war can be prevented when people, by their ingenuity, their intelligence, their memory, and their moral nature, choose to do so. Force can be eliminated as a means of political action only if it be opposed with an equal or greater force—which is economic and moral and which is backed by collective police power, so that in a community of nations no one nation or group of nations will have the opportunity to commit acts of aggression against any neighbor, anywhere in the world.

The machinery for enforcing peace is important and indispensable; but even more important is that there be established a moral situation, which will support and operate this machinery. As the last war ended, an attempt was made to construct an orderly world society capable of self-control. It was an idealistic and revolutionary plan. But like the first automobile, it moved haltingly and was more of a novelty than a success. For a while men's hopes focused on the plan; but it was never universally accepted. The faith was not there, nor the courage.

Today many nations are working together with unbelievable energy and with harmony of feeling and interest. They are united at the moment by the desire to win battles, but they are also united by common principles and by a conviction that their people ultimately want the same thing from life—freedom, peace, security, the chance to live as individuals.

Such collaboration has its origin in the democratic spirit, which infects men regardless of latitude or longitude, and it has been fed by the close association between nations which are geographically near neighbors—as, for example, the inter-American powers. Canada has been a good neighbor to the United States for many years, and the Canadian border, never fortified, stands today as a symbol of what the world will be when men's faith becomes great enough and their heads become hard enough.

Still another answer to fear is found in the concept of the United Nations. For the first time in history, twenty-eight nations have been acting together, in the very midst of a mortal struggle, to set down the specifications of a peace settlement and the aims of war and post-war action. Their representatives, meeting in Washington on New Year's Day, 1942, signed a historic Declaration by United Nations, saying:

The Governments signatory hereto,

Having subscribed to a common program of purposes and principles embodied in the Joint Declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland dated August 14, 1941, known as the Atlantic Charter,

Being convinced that complete victory over their enemies is essential to defend life, liberty, independence and religious freedom, and to preserve human rights and justice in their own lands as well as in other lands, and that they are now engaged in a common struggle against savage and brutal forces seeking to subjugate the world,

DECLARE:

(1) Each Government pledges itself to employ its full resources, military or economic, against those members of the Tripartite Pact and its adherents with which such government is at war.

(2) Each Government pledges itself to cooperate with the Governments signatory hereto and not to make a separate armistice or peace with the enemies.

The foregoing declaration may be adhered to by other nations which are, or which may be, rendering material assistance and contributions in the struggle for victory over Hitlerism.

The nations signing the Declaration by United Nations are: The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, China, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Poland, South Africa, Yugoslavia, and the United States of America. On June 14, Mexico and the Philippine Islands adhered to the Declaration by United Nations.

Can anyone be deaf to the sound of hope in this assemblage? Men have not achieved their goal, but at least they have collectively aspired to it, and have accepted a responsibility for it which is continuing and not merely fitful. The work is to go on. The new building will indeed be built, whatever its shape, whatever its appointments, whatever its defects.

Those are the goals of the peace and the hope of the world. But the specific and immediate problem, the first move to free people from fear, is to achieve a peaceable world which has been deprived of its power to destroy itself. This can only be accomplished by disarming the aggressors and keeping them disarmed. Last time they were disarmed, but they were not prevented from rearming. This time they will be disarmed in truth.

It will be remembered that the inquisitive Ben Franklin, testing the lightning with his kite, found in the storm's noisy violence the glimmerings of a secret which later illuminated the world. His example suggests that good news is sometimes hidden in bad weather. Today, in the storm which rages across the whole earth, men are sending up their kites to the new lightning, to try its possibilities and to prepare for clearing skies.

The Four Freedoms guide them on. Freedom of speech and religion, freedom from want and from fear—these belong to all the earth and to all men everywhere. Our own country, with its ideas of equality, is an experiment which has been conducted against odds and with much patience and, best of all, with some success for most people. It has prospered and brought fresh hope to millions and new good to humanity. Even in the thick of war the experiment goes ahead with old values and new forms. Life is change. The earth shrinks in upon itself and we adjust to a world in motion, holding fast to the truth as we know it, confident that as long as the love of freedom shows in the eyes of men, it will show also in their deeds.

POLITICS AND HIGHER EDUCATION IN NEW MEXICO

By WILLIAM H. EDWARDS¹

State Teachers College, Brockport, New York

Some New Mexico governors acquire national publicity by saying: "I ain't goin' to stop sayin' ain't," and by rejuvenating the subjunctive as in "When I were nominated Governor I were sick in bed." Some also acquire it by appointing spoils politicians as regents of their higher educational institutions. The appointment of partisans as regents, however, is less than an innovation in New Mexico. This perversion of educational institutions to subserve the ends of spoils for politicians, and not of education for youth, has been a long-festering sore on the body politic.² Even those who were interested in the welfare of higher education despaired of improvement; and, although a popular topic of conversation, the attitude was one of cynicism. Like the weather, everybody talked about it but nobody did anything about it. That is, until the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools investigated and discredited the New Mexico State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts in the spring of 1940. The regard of high political officialdom for the North Central Association was promptly expressed in language which was hardly in form for publication. Politely translated, the reaction in political circles was: Who are these meddling investigators to come into the state and tell the people how to run their government and educational institutions?

This discreditation not only greatly impaired the reputation and jeopardized the future of New Mexico State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, but it also hit the politicians where it

¹ Professor Edwards was a member of the faculty at New Mexico State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts from 1934 to 1941.

² J. H. Vaughan, *History and Government of New Mexico* (State College, New Mexico: C. L. Vaughan, 1921), p. 328; L. B. Bloom and T. C. Donnelly, *New Mexico History and Civics* (Albuquerque: The University Press, 1933), p. 405.

hurt the most. After all, they could not exploit an institution which might not continue to exist. So something had to be done. Well, what did the North Central Association want done and how much would it hurt to do it?

First, the Association said that one of the main reasons for investigating the institution was to determine "the extent to which political influences and pressures have affected the academic program." This bad news was followed by such statements as the following:

The terms of office of the appointive members are four years in length, and the members serve concurrently. In other words, there is no overlapping of Board membership to provide some measure of suitability and continuity in the policies adopted by the Board The truth is, that a change [of governors] can, and frequently does, result in a radical change in the Board membership, and therein lies one of the most discouraging handicaps with which the college has to deal in its efforts to build up an effective educational program.

There are a great many ugly rumors and much persistent gossip of an unsavory nature current . . . in the State . . . concerning political activity and interference in connection with the control and operation of the . . . State College there is much testimony to the effect that many evils that have existed in the past, or exist at present, were and are made possible by existing, unstable system of general control for a tax-supported institution of higher education in New Mexico.

Interviews with substantial citizens of Las Cruces . . . revealed the very general belief that there has always been more or less political manipulation in connection with the operation of the college they expressed . . . regret of the seeming unwillingness of recent state administrations to forget politics and its implications in making appointments to the board. They stated also that they have no hope that conditions will improve significantly until the governing body of the college is made up of the finest citizens of the State serving long-time staggered terms.¹

After elaborating some sixteen charges of misconduct by the board of regents, including the fact that the college had had three presidents and two acting presidents in six years, the Association

¹ *Las Cruces Sun-News*, April 12, 1940.

recommended constitutional reorganization of the state boards of regents:

Having visited . . . three of the institutions of higher education . . . the examiners [believe] that the future welfare of higher education in that state is dependent upon the establishment of a single non-partisan board . . . to be made up of nine members appointed by the governor . . . to serve for not less than six years, but preferably for nine, and the terms of office staggered in order to guarantee stability and continuity of policy The establishment of such a board constitutes a very real challenge to that part of the population of New Mexico with an abiding belief in the high purposes of college and university education.¹

Thus, the prime importance of this episode of politics in education resides in the fact that it presents one of the most clear-cut cases of the close cause-and-effect relationship between the form of board organization and an effective educational program. As such, the case deserves the careful consideration of the academic profession. And it constitutes a challenge to those who hold that the form of overhead organization of an educational institution is not important, that it is not material, not even desirable, to provide a strong type of board organization with a relatively large number of members with long overlapping terms so that no governor or political machine may control a majority of its members.

Believing with the North Central Association and with most of the faculty members of the state institutions that no fundamental improvement in the condition of the New Mexico State College could be made until a constitutional amendment providing for an independent board was adopted, the writer prepared a plan² of constitutional reorganization based upon the suggestions of the North Central Association. This plan was presented to a joint meeting of the chapters of the American Association of University Professors at the State College and the University of New Mexico. Printed copies of the plan were widely distributed by these two chapters. The plan, summarized in the following section, was

¹ *Las Cruces Sun-News*, April 12, 1940.

² W. H. Edwards, "The New Mexico Boards of Regents: A Proposal for Constitutional Reorganization," *New Mexico Quarterly Review*, XI (Feb., 1941), pp. 5-24.

considered by the legislature as one of two alternative proposals for a constitutional amendment.

II

Purpose and Justification of the Board Form of Organization. One of the great challenges of the democratic way of life is to maintain a balance between (1) popular control of education and (2) the independence and integrity of an institution of learning in the realization of scientific truths and cultural values. This challenge makes the proper rôle of a board of regents a subject crowded with implications. Much has been said and much remains to be said on this intriguing and somewhat paradoxical problem. It is sufficient to say here that, in view of the existing practices of political parties, the board form of organization is desirable not only to maintain democratic control of education but also to prevent partisan control of education. Despite the somewhat hazy stand which educators have taken in favor of an independent board form of organization, there seems to be no settled public policy toward the rôle and purpose of the board of regents or the manner of its organization in order to make it independent of partisan control.

On the contrary, within the past twenty-five years political scientists generally and state reorganizers in particular have contended that the only way to have democratic control of public administration, including education, is to have partisan control over administration through the governor's unrestricted power of appointment and removal. Such a dogmatic contention seems undemocratic, and to apply such a contention in the field of education would seem to undermine democracy based upon enlightened citizenship and to destroy the independence and integrity of educational institutions.

Therefore, the fundamental assumption throughout this article is that the primary purpose of the board form of organization is to take educational institutions out of spoils politics. If a weak board is established, the main reason for having a board at all is vitiated. The central problem is frankly to establish a board which is strong enough to keep the institutions independent of political

factions and of officials who go in and out of office every two or four years. The board's primary purpose is often stated in terms of positive functions of maintaining stability, continuity of policy, long-range planning, and permanent tenure for the administration and faculty.

The most important specific function of the board is to appoint and remove the president of the institution. The president should serve for an indefinite term and should be removed only for incompetence. If there are frequent changes in the presidency of an educational institution, it is a reflection upon either the good faith or the wisdom of the board and a sign that the board is unmindful of the welfare of the institution.

Likewise, the board form of organization must imply the separation of policy and administration. This means that the appointment of subordinate officers and employees and all detailed administrative action should be vested in the president with power to delegate to subordinates. If the board has not sufficient confidence in the ability of the president to allow him a free hand in the management of the institution, it should remove him. Any attempt to meddle in the purely administrative affairs of the institution is *prima facie* evidence of a lack of confidence in the president or a lack of intelligence or integrity on the part of the board.

The board form of organization is also designed to provide for democratic representation in administration and for the performance of quasi-legislative and policy-determining functions. As a democratic representative body the board serves as a connecting link between the people of the state and the permanent personnel of the institution. It should interpret public opinion to the administration and should in turn interpret the educational policies and program of the institution to the groups that form public opinion. If the board is to be an effective instrument for popular control, its members should represent as far as possible the various interests and opinions of the people of the state. By representing the citizen interests the board may prevent bureaucratic tendencies. Such a democratic check is essential in our complex industrial society where the general legislative body must of necessity delegate broad discretionary powers to many government agencies and a multitude of public servants. When sub-legislative func-

tions are performed in administration, sub-legislative bodies such as boards of regents are needed to perform them.

Some states require representation of particular interests on boards, such as the requirement that agricultural and manufacturing interests shall be represented on boards of agricultural and mechanical colleges. Some states also provide for geographic representation. The merits of such specific requirements depend upon the educational objectives of the institution and the conditions within the particular state. The North Central Association declares that a wide occupational distribution of board members is a vital factor to be considered in accrediting an institution. Those with as many as one-third of the board members from a single occupation are rated as institutions inferior in "general excellence" and "administration:"

One of the important purposes served by the board is the bringing together of representative points of view that reflect adequately the attitudes and sentiments of the entire constituency of the institution . . . the achievement of this purpose might be inhibited by too great a preponderance of board members from any single occupational group.¹

Appointment of Board Members by Governor. Since the predominant method of selecting boards of regents for state institutions is appointment by the governor, and since it is superior to the alternative methods of popular election or election by the legislature, this analysis will be confined to the problems connected with the former method of selection. The independence of a board of regents requires that no one governor shall appoint a majority of the board members. In achieving this independence, the three factors of number of members, length of terms, and overlapping of terms should be closely related, and these factors in turn should be closely related to the length of term of the governor. Indeed, whether the governor appoints a party worker rather than a citizen interested in educational progress depends largely upon whether the governor can dominate the board by appointing a majority of its members. Hence, in determining the personal

¹ J. D. Russell and F. W. Reeves, *The Evaluation of Higher Institutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936), VI ("Administration"), p. 22.

qualifications and character of board members, the realistic factors of number of members and length and overlapping of terms are more significant than constitutional moralizing on the importance of appointing a "nonpartisan" or "bipartisan" board or "intelligent and upright citizens" and "citizens of high moral character." Such idealistic phrases in constitutions and statutes are nugatory. As for the bipartisan board, it seems both illogical and futile. It officially injects partisanship into the board, and the governor, at least in New Mexico, may appoint a citizen who is only a nominal member of the minority party and who is in fact a political supporter of his administration.

Members and Terms. An analysis of sixty governing boards of state universities and agricultural and mechanical colleges¹ indicated that only three of the sixty are as weak as the New Mexico boards with respect to number of members and tenure. Even these three have superior safeguards for tenure and removal. Of the sixty boards, twenty-seven have fewer than nine members, and thirty-three have nine members or more. If the New Mexico boards were increased from five to nine members, as recommended by the North Central Association, they would be changed from among the smallest to the average and most typical in size. As regards tenure, only two other boards have as short terms as the New Mexico boards, and only eleven others have terms of less than six years. Twenty-three boards have six-year terms. Twenty-five boards have terms of more than six years, and fifteen of these have terms of nine years or more. If the tenure of the New Mexico boards were increased from four to nine years as recommended by the North Central Association, it would be much nearer the customary tenure provisions of these sixty boards.

Long overlapping terms are essential factors in accrediting higher educational institutions. The North Central Association found that institutions whose boards serve six years or more are far superior in "general excellence" and "administration" to others whose boards serve less than six years; that short terms prevent satisfactory overlapping; that unless terms are at least six years overlapping is not satisfactory; that even where terms are six years

¹ Edwards, *op. cit.*, p. 7 (Table: Members of Sixty Boards of Regents of State Universities and A. and M. Colleges—Number of Members and Terms).

or more institutions with satisfactory provisions for overlapping are superior to those with unsatisfactory provisions.

It is clear that if a majority of the board are new in the office there is likely to be a lack of continuity of policy, and abrupt changes in the plans and activities of the institutions may result. Such changes . . . should come gradually rather than suddenly, and the best safeguard against too sudden changes is to have a provision whereby at least two-thirds of the board members will always have had at least one full year of experience in office.¹

Removal. Constitutional safeguards are necessary to prevent partisan removal of board members. State constitutions provide that board members may be removed by the governor, by the board itself, by the courts, and by impeachment. Although removal by the governor is the prevailing method, much may be said for the other three methods because they prevent his abuse of removal power. When a board is created by statute rather than by the constitution, the legislature may in effect accomplish removal by "state reorganization acts" and "ripper bills."

If the governor may remove board members without restraint, he may be able to control the board and thereby to nullify all other safeguards and also the purposes of the board form of organization. From past experience there is sufficient reason for restricting his removal power even though governors have violated such restrictions. They have also employed their removal power as a threat to force regents to resign, thus avoiding the scandal arising from formal removal.

Provisions regarding removal power may be classified as: (1) removal without cause at the governor's pleasure; (2) removal for cause without notice and hearing; (3) removal for cause after notice and hearing. The third method is to be preferred, but the constitution should specify the causes for removal, such as neglect, incompetence, and malfeasance in office. The Idaho constitution adds the rather naïve provision that the governor must not remove

¹ Russell and Reeves, *op. cit.*, p. 20. Many other education authorities have expressed similar views: (1) Office of Education, U. S. Department of the Interior, "Survey of Land Grant Colleges and Universities" (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1930, Bulletin, 1930, no. 9, I, 58-59); (2) M. M. Chambers, "The Tenure of State University Trustees," *Educational Record*, XVIII (Jan., 1937) p. 126.

a board member for personal or political reasons. If there are no provisions to the contrary or no removal provisions at all, the state courts have generally held that summary removal is invalid; that the governor must give notice and hearing; and that the person removed may appeal to the courts. The New Mexico court, however, does not uphold these common-law safeguards which are uniformly guaranteed in other states. In this state, despite constitutional provisions restricting grounds for removal to enumerated causes, the Supreme Court has held that the governor can remove regents at will.¹

Numerous instances might be cited as evidence that governors have abused their removal power in violation of constitutional safeguards. In 1926 the governor of Washington removed two regents in order to gain control of the state university. Although the constitution limited the governor's power to cases involving misconduct, malfeasance, and incompetence, and required him to state his reasons, he removed the regents merely by stating that in his opinion the members were guilty of misconduct, without giving evidence to substantiate his charges. He then removed President Suzzalo from office despite the fact that Mr. Suzzalo was one of the outstanding educators of the nation.

Another case involved the removal of two regents of the Kansas Agricultural College. Although the Supreme Court upheld the governor's action, the Chief Justice denounced the partisan manipulation of higher education:

These charges are trivial. They were made and prosecuted, as everybody knows, for the purpose of ousting the officers named and thereby gaining political control of one of the educational institutions of the state. They were made and prosecuted in that spirit of malignant partisanship which is the curse of American politics, and they do but provoke a retaliatory assault when the trembling balance of political majorities in this state shall go the other way. They were made and prosecuted to subserve the ends of office for politicians and not for education for the youth. Similar charges and proceedings by the office-seekers of my party shall never have countenance by me, nor will I be deterred from denouncing those

¹ *State ex rel. Ulrick v. Sanchez*, 32 N. M. 265; 255 P. 1077.

made and conducted by political opponents as causeless, wicked, and despicable.¹

When governors abuse their removal power in such a crude, tyrannical manner, it would seem better to deprive them of that power and to vest it in those who would make removals only for lack of fitness to deal with educational matters.

Vacancies. An effective provision for filling vacancies for unexpired terms might well deter a governor from arbitrary removal of regents. Hence, a strong case could be made for having such vacancies filled by the remaining members of the board rather than by the governor. In any event, conflict of legal opinion concerning the nature of the appointing authority and uncertainty concerning senatorial confirmation have frequently resulted from absence of specific constitutional provisions for filling vacancies.

III

During the 1941 session of the legislature at least some of the legislators gave serious consideration to the foregoing case for a strong independent board of regents. Two members of the House of Representatives, who represented the legislative districts where the State College is located, introduced a House Resolution proposing an amendment based upon the foregoing recommendations.² This proposed amendment included the following provisions:

1. The boards of regents were to consist of five members serving for ten-year terms with one member appointed every two years. Although the proposal for nine members serving nine-year terms is to be preferred, both proposals would prevent any one governor from appointing a majority of the members because the New Mexico constitution provides two-year terms for the governor who can serve only two terms in succession.

2. Since it seemed that the legislature would insist upon senatorial confirmation, it was decided to frame the amendment so that the governor would be forced to secure such confirmation.

¹ Quoted in Chambers, *op. cit.*, p. 134.

² House Joint Resolution, No. 6 (as amended), House of Representatives, Fifteenth Legislature. (Unbound copy.)

In at least the last four administrations the governors have evaded the constitutional provision requiring such confirmation by making recess appointments and have thus nullified the four-year term provision for board members. It was, therefore, provided that the governor should appoint the board member before the meeting of the legislature in January and forthwith send the name of the member to the Senate for action.

3. The governor was denied all removal power in the provision that regents may be removed for neglect, incompetency, or malfeasance in office (1) by the board of regents, provided that not less than four members vote for removal, and that such removal shall be subject to review by a court of competent jurisdiction; (2) by judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction; and (3) by impeachment.

4. The governor's power to fill vacancies for unexpired terms was restricted in the provision that the remaining members of the board shall submit to the governor three names from which the governor shall appoint a successor. This was in lieu of the above proposal that the board itself appoint the successor.

This proposed amendment in the House Resolution was eminently satisfactory from the point of view of insuring the independence of the boards of regents from political interference. The college groups of the state and the local press expected that this amendment would be passed with perhaps minor modification. A Senate amendment, however, had been introduced which was looked upon by many to be so futile and inadequate that it would not be given serious consideration.¹ It provided for a board of five members serving for overlapping six-year terms. Although a removal clause was included, there was in effect no substantial change from the existing removal power as provided elsewhere in the constitution, and no provision was made for notice and hearing. In view of the past ruling of the Supreme Court it would seem the governor could still remove regents at will with no safeguard against his arbitrary action. The Senate amendment is no improvement over the existing constitutional provisions except to increase the terms from four to six years. And this improvement

¹ Senate Joint Resolution, No. 10, Senate, Fifteenth Legislature. (Unbound copy.)

is more apparent than real. The governor may appoint a majority of the board and thus dominate it. Further, as the Director of the New Mexico Taxpayers Association has indicated,

There is nothing in the proposed constitutional amendment to enforce the constitutional requirement for senatorial confirmation. Unless the governor follows the requirement for submitting his nomination to the Senate for confirmation, the six-year term provision will be as futile as the four-year term.¹

Much to the surprise of everyone except a few insiders, the Senate amendment was passed. And the story of its passage would make an interesting tale of education in politics. It is sufficient here to say that the governor appeared before a joint meeting of both houses on the first day of the split session permitting passage of bills, and asked for immediate passage on that day of the Senate amendment on the pretext that any delay would prevent re-crediting the College for at least another year. Attempts of the opponents of the Senate amendment to secure the parliamentary right of full and free debate were unavailing. It was but a matter of minutes before the Senate amendment passed both houses.

Amendments to the State Constitution must be ratified by popular vote. The Senate Amendment probably will be ratified at the polls in November, 1942 because there is no opposition. Certainly the party organizations will give it full support as a gesture of political repentance calculated to win the favor of the North Central Association without setting up barriers to continued partisan domination of higher education in the state.

Partisan interference in the American system of public education is a direct and dangerous threat to the democratic way of life. It is the first step toward Nazi or any other form of Fascistic control. Dictatorship means a one-party system and the control of educational institutions by the political party for spoils and for propaganda. It also means the destruction of free scientific inquiry and academic freedom and the substitution of political propaganda. In a war in which we are dedicated to the destruction of the doctrines of dictatorship, the least we can do is to remove our educa-

¹ A letter from Rupert F. Asplund to the writer, dated July 25, 1942. Mr Asplund and the Taxpayers Association favor ratification of the amendment.

tional institutions from this first step toward Hitlerism —the partisan domination of education. If the American people cannot make democracy work well enough to clean up our public schools and state educational institutions and safeguard them against perversion and exploitation, then America is indeed in difficulty.

IF YOU WANT TO RISE TO THE TOP OF THE TREE¹

By MERIBETH E. CAMERON

Milwaukee-Downer College

Every fall many young men and women enter the profession of college teaching in the United States. In many cases they have already earned the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, but for others among them there is still ahead a long struggle for that passport to academic advancement. In any event they find themselves instructors, at the bottom of the ladder of academic ranks, honors, and privileges. Customarily, the ladder has three lower rungs, those of instructor, assistant professor, and associate professor, and then at the top the exalted level of full professor, where all is feasting and fun after the hard climb from the bottom. Some colleges and universities have done a bit of recarpentering on this traditional piece of academic furniture and have only two preliminary steps, while a few anti-traditionalist institutions have removed the ladder completely and have established a regime of equality where all are tutors together. But in those many colleges where the hierarchical arrangement persists the young instructor soon perceives himself as the lowest form of academic life. After all, being an instructor is not a happy lot, especially if there is any risk that it will be a long-lasting one. The instructor has most of the responsibilities of the professor and yet is exposed to the lacerations of pride which result from being denied that blessed title. He is a journeyman, who may or may not be able to secure a mastership. Perhaps the young teacher's mind should be on pure scholarship, service to his students and no other topics, but he is almost inhumanly free from dross if he is not also acutely interested in getting advancement in academic rank.

The machinery of promotion varies in different institutions, ranging from the blessing of the department head and formal ap-

¹ Gilbert, W. S., *H. M. S. Pinafore*, Act I.

proval by administration and trustees to an elaborate inquiry into the candidate's qualifications by some representative body. Even so, the legalities and the actualities may run far apart. For politicians who are apt to scorn professors as impractical, a period of residence in Academe is recommended. Many academicians not only know their Machiavelli, but practice it. In general, though, how does one go about getting advancement in rank?

The primary, would that it were the universal, way is honest virtue. Promotions have been won by genuine scholarship, able teaching, and real usefulness to the college community. Of course, to determine how many advancements are the result of real scholarship one must be able to define and locate real scholarship; that is not the purpose of this paper, which is concerned not with how to become a scholar but with how to become a professor. Fortunately the two groups overlap and, even if not all professors are great scholars, great scholars do become professors, as anyone can testify who has spent much time in colleges. However, the profession sometimes moves in mysterious ways to secure the advancement of its members. It is the examples of rightful eminence which throw into relief the cases of attainment of academic distinction by some other route.

II

How did Cox of Jenkinson University get to be professor of economics, a status which he has held for many years? (It should be stated immediately that neither Cox nor Jenkinson exists; the customary disclaimer about any resemblance to persons or institutions living or dead applies. But fragments of Cox and bits of Jenkinson can be found in colleges from one coast of this continent to the other and a collector of academic aberrations can without too much difficulty assemble Cox and his milieu from these scattered items, much as a museum curator might bring together an exhibit of Victorian horrors.) Could it have been scholarship which elevated Cox to his high estate? Perhaps. After all, by the tests of sheer bulk his scholarly production has been weighed and found far from wanting. The trade journals of his field have in the course of Cox's many years in the profession

published some thirty articles from his pen, and the President of Jenkinson often refers to this fact in lecturing the younger members of the faculty on the way in which they should go. Casual inquiry has failed to discover many of Cox's colleagues who are habitual readers of his productions and those few are chary of criticizing them. Cox is the only person on the faculty who is supposed to know anything about employee-employer relationships in the shoe industry in Massachusetts between 1810 and 1820, and it ill behooves his colleagues to throw stones since they too live in academic glass houses. There are some who can remember that once in the far past there was a question of reducing staff and Cox and Grey were the two candidates for elimination. But Cox already had several articles to his credit, while Grey was struggling with a book which would take him a long time to complete. Cox stayed and Grey went. When Grey's book finally came out, it was a scholarly success, but could one blame the administration of Jenkinson for not keeping him when all he had to show was promise?

Could it have been Cox's ability as a teacher which made him a full professor? Unkind veterans of his courses have often suggested that a phonograph recording of his lectures and the retirement of Cox on a pension would save the university money without any material loss in its educational service. Could it be his interest in the general educational program and philosophy of Jenkinson University? He long ago ceased to be named to committees because of his tendency to emit much sound but little sense. He has been a full professor for twenty-five years, and his colleagues are at a loss to understand just how he got there and in what way his occupancy of the rank enhances its dignity and serves the cause of justice in academic life. Perhaps, after all, sheer longevity is the answer. Jenkinson University seems capable of supporting about three economists, one full professor, one associate or assistant professor, and one instructor. Any serious change in this disposition would upset the budget and is, therefore, discouraged. Moreover, creation of a second full professorship in economics would give economics another vote in the faculty council and thus infringe a noble principle: the approximate equality of all subject-matter fields in voting power in that body. But, some years ago,

when Cox was only an instructor, Appleton, the head of the department, died; in the general shift which followed Cox became an assistant professor, and Billings, who had been an associate professor, moved to the top of the pile. Appleton was a comparatively young man whose death was unexpected, so Cox and Billings were, in a sense, lucky not to have to wait longer. Then, in due time, Billings retired, and Cox, fortified by his publication record and his long presence on the scene, became head of the department.

Did Cox ever have a call to another institution? No one seems to be sure. But everyone at Jenkinson knows the case of John Smith, now associate professor of political science at Jenkinson. He is only four years out of graduate school and two years ago was a mere instructor. Back in the good old days, when Cox was earning his spurs, seniority was very important and promotions came, sooner or later, but as a matter of course. Recently, yield on the endowment has shrunk, donors are not as easy to find as they once were, and so the university administration has adopted a negative policy on promotions. The members of the faculty may remain at the rank which they held when financial stringency descended on Jenkinson, they should rejoice that they have jobs, and they must not expect promotions except for very evident and pressing cause. Smith is one of those who demonstrated evident and pressing cause. He is a pushing young man, energetic, slightly pompous, self-assured and very vocal. His field is international relations, and during his first two years at Jenkinson every woman's club and fraternal organization listened with rapt attention to his prophecies about the European situation. If they were not always accurate predictions, it really didn't matter; most of his audience had forgotten what he had prophesied would happen yesterday in their interest in what he said would happen tomorrow. He would speak for nothing, to the disgust of old-line lecturers in the community, and he was always very amiable. Smith has a good business head. One of the senior members of the faculty at Timpson College, nearby, was a friend of a friend of Smith's, and Smith cultivated his acquaintance from the outset. When a vacancy occurred at Timpson, Smith was offered an assistant professorship there. The administration of Jenkinson had a problem on its hands. It could let Smith go and get another instructor, but did it want to

lose face? Smith was well known. What would the community think? Alumni were already hearing rumors of the competition for Smith's services and were suggesting that Jenkinson ought to show that it could keep good people when it had them. In the end, to maintain its prestige, Jenkinson outbid Timpson for Smith's oratorical and prophetic talents. Smith stayed at Jenkinson, but two notches higher up the ladder. Some of Smith's colleagues do not feel kindly about the whole business, but others think him a nice young man, and feel rather fatherly and pleased about his advancement. After all, Smith knew a trick which makes for promotion.

Nepotism and other forms of undue influence likewise are not unknown in the profession. There was Brown, whose uncle was on the board at Jenkinson. He had received the M.A. in Chemistry and had taken a teaching job in Hanson College. Somehow he didn't get ahead there rapidly, nor did he show any particular desire to get his Ph.D. Maybe he was waiting for Uncle Henry to help him out. Uncle Henry did. There came the day when Jackson, head of the department of chemistry at Jenkinson, retired. Mars. M., associate professor of chemistry for a number of years, and a scholarly and energetic man, had reason to expect that he would inherit the post. Then Uncle Henry intruded himself into the scene. Here was his nephew, a perfectly good chemist. And Uncle Henry himself was a generous donor to Jenkinson and a power in the land. He had no desire to exercise undue influence, of course, but he would be greatly pleased to see Brown installed at Jenkinson in a position more nearly commensurate with his talents than the one which he had been occupying at Hanson. What about Marshall? The administration recalled that Marshall had sometimes been a sort of leader of faculty opposition. He might be a nuisance in a more conspicuous position, and Uncle Henry could certainly be a nuisance in the position which he already occupied. Nephew Brown got the post.

III

Cox, Smith, and Brown have served their purpose as deliberately devised and nightmarish examples of how promotions may

be secured. Not, thank fortune, that they are always obtained or obtainable in such ways. Let us rejoice that there is probably no existing institution which quite measures down to the standards of Jenkinson in its promotion policy. As Baynes once wrote of Byzantium, an empire cannot live by vice alone. There remains a much larger issue, too large for adequate consideration here. Are the academic ranks a valuable part of American academic life? Does the traditional hierarchical arrangement constitute an appropriate stimulus to true scholarship, or does it simply encourage a scramble for places in the sun? Does its existence prevent American colleges, which have grave responsibility in preaching the democratic way of life, from being themselves practicing democracies? Will the elimination of academic ranks and reward of merit by variation in pay checks be enough to keep faculty members intellectually active? Or does that system, too, have the virtues of its defects? Are academicians of a species which needs no such material encouragement, but which seeks and dispenses knowledge gladly in comparative indifference to financial and titular reward alike?

Plenty can be said in criticism of the system of gradation of academic standing. The ranks lend an incongruously military air to the profession. Are the three lower ranks all inferior in authority and subject to the commands of a "full" professor? When administrative authority is combined with rank, as not infrequently happens, the anti-democratic possibilities of the hierarchy become more evident. A full professorship and a department headship often go together, and there are too many college departments in which the head loves to be called and to think of himself as "the chief." But does it have to be so? The election of a departmental chairman is a device which recognizes the democratic rather than the authoritarian idea of the origin of power. Even in departments where the head is appointed and holds office by virtue of superior rank, however, the attitude of the department head may make the group not a small army of which the head is commander but a republic in which he is first among equals. Any other attitude seems unworthy, in view of the fact that there is no social group which is more truly of the stuff of which effective democracies can be made than a college faculty. Its members have a certain homogeneity of preparation and outlook. Differences among

them are the comparatively minor ones of age, experience, and specific field of professional interest. In essence, they are all citizens of the republic of letters. There is no place here for a caste system. Yet the combination of tenure and administrative power in certain persons, full professors, often has the effect of creating a sharp cleavage and a degree of class consciousness. It may be protested, of course, that the academic ranks constitute a career open to talent and that a full professorship is waiting for each truly persistent and virtuous entrant upon the *cursus honorum*. True in theory, but is it true in fact? For one thing, financial difficulties in many institutions have led to a freezing of the academic structure and promotions have tended to become rare and obtainable, in some cases, only by shot-gun methods. Under such circumstances, bargaining power is very important as a means to promotion. Solid merit and usefulness, demonstrated within the institution by which one is employed, will have no result. Only advertising will pay, and many an instructor is moved to premature or meaningless publication and to the cultivation of "contacts" in the hope that some other institution will call him and thus make his virtues dramatically apparent to his present place of employment.

Perhaps in the end it can be said that the system of academic ranks, in itself, is not inimical to proper academic democracy, and may even be a suitable democratic device for recognizing achievement, provided the assignment of status is fairly made. Democracy, in our traditional definition, has not meant the maintenance of absolute equality; it has meant, rather, a fair chance to achieve whatever degree of inequality one's talents and activities deserve. If the academic ladder is truly open to talent it continues to be a respectable part of the academic scene. One of the principles of Confucian teaching applies very aptly to the case—that of the rectification of names. The Confucians insisted upon a recognizable equation between the character of the thing and the name which it bore. A ruler who did not behave like a ruler was not a ruler, a son whose conduct was not that proper to a son was not a son. If in any institution the occupants of the various ranks do not, in the great majority of cases, manifest that degree of competence and enlightenment appropriate to their station, then the

whole system of ranks will command no respect and is detrimental to the welfare of that institution. When the occupants of the lower ranks of the service cannot think of any good and logical reason why most of their superiors should be at the top, their loyalty to the institution and their confidence in the integrity and intelligence of its leadership are apt to decay. All very fine, you may say, but was it not suggested earlier in this paper that academic life often seems much like a branch of politics, and Machiavellian politics at that? Considerations of self-interest, personal relations, and finance may prevail over idealism. Moreover, human beings are not like oranges, which, when allowed to roll down an incline, can be sorted into groups in accordance with the size of the hole through which they fall. They are infinitely difficult of measurement and assessment and there can be no ranking of them which will be pleasing to everyone. All this may be granted, but there remains a principle which we are now learning very painfully in the field of international relations. Institutions must rest on moral foundations and show justice writ large, or they will not maintain the allegiance of decent human beings. If the time-honored ladder of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor is not a true ladder but a mere stage property, then the academic ranks no longer can aid true democracy in American education by providing just reward for honest labor.

THE EDUCATIONAL MEANING OF MORALE

By CARROLL D. CHAMPLIN

The Pennsylvania State College

In recent years we have become acutely and alertly propaganda-conscious. This has resulted in personal and national benefits of great value. Today we are rapidly becoming morale-conscious. From this morale-consciousness we can expect even greater material contributions to our efficiency and our productiveness. We have erred educationally in having failed to make long ago a scientific study of the sources and elements of morale.

There are several pertinent questions which should be raised. Can it be shown to be true that the public school is one of the best institutions in a democracy to bolster our morale and to help us meet crucial emergencies as they arise? Have valid criteria been set up by which we can gauge the soundness and the quality of our morale? Just what is morale more than a merely passive attitude towards the realization of the goals recommended by our community policy-makers and our national leaders? To what degree can our morale be improved by a greater familiarity with our country's history and traditions, our outstanding state papers, and the political documents that have contributed to the attainment of the promises implicit in the Bill of Rights?

It has been demonstrated objectively that morale improves when the members of any group are able to plan a program of self-development. Other favorable circumstances, based in part on Goodwin Watson's published findings in the January, 1942 issue of the *Progressive Education* magazine, are as follows:

1. The careful blueprinting of a project that involves numerous advantages.
2. Living and working together in a friendly atmosphere.
3. Being employed under conditions representing a variety of work and play activities.
4. Laying the foundation for teamwork.

5. Keeping informed concerning one's progress towards a goal that has been set up.
6. The presence of individual and group incentives.
7. Provision for physical, economic, and psychological security.
8. Having complete confidence in one's daily associates.
9. Steadfast loyalty in connection with an earnest effort to achieve a common purpose.

It has been shown that morale is heightened by reviving interest in those features of our history which stress patriotism—such as pioneering, historical literature, songs, shrines, and deeds of daring. When public policy is explained in terms of social values and when current events and daily episodes are interpreted in relation to world developments, then the solid groundwork of morale is being established; and this is precisely what our schools are preeminently equipped to do well. We can create a will to win the war and the peace by means of knowledge, judgment, and the feelings of the people.

II

In September, 1941 President Roosevelt recommended that we launch an educational campaign to help our young people to understand the "many complicated problems of these critical times." This is both a compliment to education and a challenge to our schools, which have been known on other strategic occasions to serve the state constructively. It is not education for death that is offered in our schools, but training for a long and useful life. Our schools are not for barbarians, but for refined and competent junior citizens, youth in the process of building habits and attitudes worthy of what is supposed to be an age of rational, moral conduct.

Americans are known around the world for having a great deal of personal self-assurance in the rough and tumble bouts of everyday life; but from the viewpoint of the international battle-royal our footing is not so sure and our progress is much less certain. Right now we need a national self-reliance based on competence in the fields of industry, diplomacy, and armed combat. Consciousness of this power to hold our own in a world of rival nations will prove

contagious among the millions of Americans who are skeptical concerning our position. Knowledge, skill, and the insight that comes from a thorough understanding of the international situation are the commodities that the schools have to offer in this time of doubt and timidity.

The problem of national and community morale is primarily educational. Our schools are the focal center of the process of socialization, and the quality of instruction provided in any population area is an excellent index of the culture and standard of morale maintained in that locality. Our professionally trained teachers are in a strategic position to build the kind of morale that is necessary for winning the war and determining the nature of the peace. There is something of value that can be done in connection with every subject and activity sponsored by a progressive school. Well executed pageants and skillfully conducted forum programs are helpful when the full sweep of their meaning is given popular interpretation. Music also furnishes many opportunities to inspire resolution and aspiration.

III

Morale depends on the mental alertness of the masses and their intelligent grasp of matters relating to our local and national well-being. The normal activities of our institutions must be allowed to continue unimpaired, with special emphasis on those exercises that keep us buoyed up with hope and confidence in our ability to weather the storm now raging. Our bodies are going to be stronger and more efficient than ever because of the hard work we are all doing. If we can adjust ourselves and discipline our minds and settle down to a sane and sensible routine of toil, reflective reading, and moderate recreation, not all the poisonous propaganda emanating from Berlin, Rome, and Tokyo will be able to harm our American morale.

Morale is built up through the mobilization of mind-power. It requires of us a rational reaction to the necessity for restricting our recreations, indulgences, and pleasures. Morale is preserved and nourished by moral supply-lines that are kept wide open, and its continuance on a high level is conditioned by the fulfillment of a

far-flung vision of personal and group obligation. It means that we can count on the toughness of our moral fiber in an emergency, offering a philosophy of life consistent with our habits and commensurate with our idealism. Morale makes possible the strenuous pursuit of an objective, if and when necessary. Morale implies that we comprehend the meaning and the price of sacrificial service for others. Morale reveals a solidarity that is inward and personal as well as outward and social. Morale implies the possession of attributes that help us to serve causes and survive crises, accept rebuffs and submit to defeat so that eventually we may be able to overthrow the forces of evil and mete out punishment to those who are deserving. These are all qualities that we have to acquire through the painstaking processes of education.

In the current crisis we have a problem of morale that challenges our best possible patriotism. In a democracy loyalty is rooted in knowledge and understanding, and confidence is generated by study and discovery. Fear is destructive, to be offset by the invigorating process of growth through learning. The desire to avenge Pearl Harbor is an effective incentive to effort, and the report of major victories in the southern Pacific area is a positive force of great motivating value; but our civilian morale can be bolstered best by renewing our faith in democracy through the recognition of the genius, devotion, and sacrifice of our pioneers—the leaders our forefathers followed and the heroes who won for us the freedom we now enjoy. Today more than ever we should be guided by the indomitable courage and expansive vision of the authors of our personal, civil, and social liberty.

Our morale is active to the degree that we appreciate the threat to the democratic institutions we cherish. Our morale is high to the extent that we are able to look ahead and learn to use the language of reconciliation as we visualize a peaceful future. Our faith is profound as we prepare to launch a program of education that will convince the whole world that war is futile. Only men worthy of the communion table should dominate the deliberations of the post-war conference table. They should be able to see what Germany, Italy, and Japan might have been had they dedicated themselves to the comfort and happiness of the peoples they have recently subjugated. They should be guided by the clear

analysis and logical reasoning that characterize genuine statesmanship.

Morale involves a firm belief in human nature and in the kind of freedom that will further evolutionary progress towards a better civilization. One of the major aims of education is the production of well-adjusted individuals, men and women able to carry their share of the responsibilities of modern society. Morale is to a community what moral stamina is to the individual. It represents coordination of body, mind, and spirit. Winning our personal battles and maintaining a wholesome internal condition will help us to determine our national destiny, and will save us from an unfavorable outward appearance. A resolute attitude towards national obligations and international crisis responsibilities, in which men and women of strength refuse to reverse their stand after making a positive decision based on insight and convictions, is a criterion of morale. Mental and moral flabbiness is due to the absence of morale.

We are going into this second world war deliberately and purposefully, and we are going in gradually and cautiously. Our deliberation and caution may account for some of the awkwardness and inefficiency in our production program and the tardy emergence of our combat blueprint. We are not only feeling our way carefully in full possession of our reasoning power; we are also looking ahead, planning a long war and contemplating the reconstruction needs of the post-war world. We won the first war because we planned in terms of a ten-year struggle. We may win the peace this time because we are giving close attention to the future needs of the nations. By means of our morale, moreover, we are keeping the restraining machinery of our democracy operating at all times—a situation erroneously interpreted by our enemies as a weakness. In reality it is a wholesome and encouraging procedure and definitely related to the very cause for which we are fighting.

IV

Our morale has led us to resolve to restore the freedom, rights, and honor of those people who have been forcibly ejected from

their homes and brutally persecuted. We feel it to be our moral duty to help strike down those who are guilty of continuous and cruel aggression. The whole world looks to us for ethical, economic, and political leadership, not only the abject victims of war, but also the sincere minority of the totalitarian masses, men and women languishing in concentration camps or watching sharply for opportunities to escape from bondage and tyranny. Never again must we sell short the parliament of man and the fine-spirited people and nations forced to become the martyrs of a ruthless enemy. We must be prepared and eager to give generous aid and comfort to the victims of aggression and suppression.

Hitler's type of morale depends on stimulants—propaganda, exaggeration, and sentimentalism—and on coercion. It thrives on victory, and is best when his armed forces are moving forward, both on the battlefield and in the courts of diplomacy. The normal ingredients of a positive democratic morale are based on the rebirth and enrichment of the human spirit. A morale of forthright quality is grounded in the truth. It thrives on the close relationship it bears to the conscience of a community or a country. It is both the cause and the effect of a proper attitude towards the problems of war and peace. It is both a symptom and a source of the strength of a refined and informed body of citizens. In it all our children should be taught to be sympathetically courageous and appreciatingly patient. Ours is not the sensational approach to international greatness, but in the long run it may prove to be the most fruitful form of leadership. Whereas the Nazis employ coercion, we recommend and practice friendly, creative collaboration.

Japan, like Germany, is a promising nation gone wrong through the worship of military ideals, models, and methods. Education has failed in Japan just as completely as it has failed in Germany. Education in these countries has produced a bubble—a sleek, hollow shell of social and moral unreality. In each case it has failed to achieve a solid substance of national culture. The totalitarian system calls forth a false unity, a shallow national structure without the desired foundation of truth, beauty, and goodness, qualities so essential to a lasting civilization. Under the authoritarian dictatorship, disagreement and division are late in arriving, but revolution and destruction soon follow their appearance.

In a democracy, however, differences are encouraged and criticism is capitalized for the ultimate good of the cause to which all kinds of people are contributing in their many individualistic ways. Dissension and cleavage disappear when danger approaches from the outside. It is then that the morale which education has developed begins to function as the major source of a nation's salvation.

V

Implicit in morale is the ability of a people to take the long view, have a keen sense of perspective, maintain a reservoir of moral stamina, replace little hypocrisies with incontestable sincerity, and emphasize the spiritual quality of life as well as the materialistic aspects of existence. This ability presupposes a complete and studiously conceived system of public education, honestly administered and skillfully supervised—liberal, vocational, and general education in the broadest and deepest sense.

Morale is intimately related to character and culture, and it involves the intelligent and purposeful pooling of the mental, social, vocational, and civic assets of any community. It calls for the interest and effort of all who can contribute concretely to the realization of any notable aspiration. Our one great aim now is to save the nations that have been espousing the cause of freedom and justice. Because of our determination and as a result of the kind of education we have been giving our children, the Nazis, Italians, and Japanese fear us man for man. They know we are united—in the last analysis and in the best sense. They know likewise that our boys have not been regimented or robotized into the cannon-fodder type of soldier. Our men will work and fight together in good spirit, demonstrating the team play they learned in athletic participation. Each man, moreover, will display sufficient independence and initiative to take care of himself in any immediate and personal crisis.

Our experiences and experiments through the 1940's will help us to get a better picture of what a democracy ought to be and what education is going to become. It will help us to preserve the schools and colleges we have and to produce the better institutions which we have long needed.

THE UNDERGRADUATE IN THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

By JOHN J. LUND

Duke University

The difficulties in the problem of adequate library service to undergraduates arise primarily from the heterogeneous nature of the undergraduate's academic work in his junior and senior years. During his freshman and sophomore years the student is obviously engaged in acquiring a general education. At the end of these two years, however, most institutions agree that he has not yet completed his general education, but they also agree that two years more would be too much to devote to its completion. Hence, since the student must stay these last two years in order to obtain his degree, it is arranged that in addition to putting the finishing touches on his general education he shall do specialized work, or shall "major" in a certain field. As a rule he also takes some graduate courses.

In considering library service for the usual undergraduate curriculum, we must, therefore, begin by recognizing the two phases of the problem. First, the library must provide the reading materials for the student's general education program, which comprises all of the first two years' and part of the last two years' work; and, second, the library must provide the specialized materials needed for the student's advanced work in his major subject during the last two years.

A college library, with the present undergraduate curriculum, faces a real difficulty in providing both types of library material, because in the second group the material is both extensive and expensive. And, in addition, a college library has the problem of providing for the library needs of faculty members and of building up special collections for other purposes. In a university library, however, the problem is much simpler, or can be made so, since it is reducible to the single problem of providing the library materials

for the undergraduate's general education. For a university library has usually been built up primarily as a research or scholarly library and can, therefore, be expected to have, as part of its regular collection, whatever is needed by juniors and seniors in their specialized "major" work. And if these students can do this work at all, they can also use, or learn to use, the main stack collection, the main catalogue, and the other library tools used by graduate students and faculty.

But for supplying the library materials needed in that part of the undergraduate's work which is devoted to his general education, the stack collection, the main catalogue, and the regular reference service of the university library are obviously not suited. The student himself is not ready to use them when he first enters the university, and the use that he might make of them would not justify the expense of maintaining them. The problem of the university library with reference to the undergraduate is then how best to provide the library materials and the library service needed for that part of the undergraduate's educational program which is devoted to acquiring a general education.

In meeting this problem we must first of all recognize that service to undergraduates¹ in a university library cannot be treated as an incidental aspect of the regular library program of service to the university as a whole. The main stack collection, catalogue, and reference service cannot efficiently and adequately meet the needs of faculty and graduate students (including seniors and juniors doing advanced work), and at the same time of undergraduates pursuing a general education program. Any attempt to make the same type of library service do for both groups cannot but result in unsatisfactory service to each. The device of setting up undergraduate "reserves," for instance, does not meet the situation; it is nothing more than a convenient way out of certain practical difficulties caused by a large number of users for a limited number of assigned books. And while it is true that no one will claim that the reserve book room in itself provides adequate library service to undergraduates, it is unfortunately true that the undergraduate

¹ From here on the term "undergraduate" is used to refer to that part of undergraduate work which is concerned with general education, as explained in the preceding section.

is often slow to acquaint himself with any other part of the library, and may for a long time think that the reserve book collection represents all that the library has to offer him.

What the undergraduate needs is a separate comprehensive book collection, selected to meet his general educational needs, and placed in a room on open shelves where he can have free access to it; a catalogue that he can understand and use; and reference service and advice from a staff that is interested in and has time to answer his questions. All this can be provided only by dissociating undergraduate service completely from the rest of the university library's service and adapting its several aspects to the special needs of undergraduates. How this is to be done we shall go on to consider.

The Book Collection

In describing the undergraduate book collection we can begin by saying that it will contain only good books and significant books—the books by which men have become educated and cultured in the past, and by which they can still become so. The total number of such books is surprisingly small, but with the main university library stack collection always close at hand, we need not hesitate to limit the undergraduate collection to “good” and “significant” books.

For the actual selection of titles we have comprehensive guides in the Shaw and the Mohrhardt lists; shorter ones like the St. Johns list, the Trinity College *List of Books for a College Student's Reading*, and *Classics of the Western World*; and such useful handbooks as the *Bookman's Manual*. And, finally, the reserve book lists of any particular university must be taken into account, for they reflect the peculiar character of the instructional program and of the undergraduate needs at that institution. On the basis of these lists and his own knowledge, an intelligent and educated librarian can probably compile a list that will be better than any one of them—at least for the particular undergraduate student body with which he is working.

It is not difficult, though it takes time, to make a list of the Classical writers with whom an educated man should be acquainted. The same would hold for Renaissance writers, for Vic-

torian writers, etc.¹ Then come the secondary or critical works, and a librarian who knows how to use subject bibliographies should be able to compile a list of standard and usable works about the history, civilization and thought of the Ancient world, the Renaissance, the Victorian era, etc. At any rate, here is a really professional job for the librarian.

The size of the undergraduate collection is not so easily stated. For the literary classics it is possible to fix a level of significance or value, but for the secondary and critical works this is more difficult, since there is no general consensus to guide us. Then there are such questions as how many of a particular author's titles to include—are the insignificant works of a significant author in themselves significant? But it will probably not be far wrong to say that an undergraduate can acquire a general education with the aid of a library of 5000 titles. And if we admit that it can be done with this number of titles, we would have to show cause for an increase in this number, since any increase brings with it added complications and problems—for the librarian as well as the student. Nor is there any danger that with only 5000 titles undergraduates will become stereotyped for lack of variety in available reading matter—we might ask ourselves, for instance, how many books an undergraduate actually reads now in the course of his general education work. It is understood, of course, that the undergraduate has access to the main stack collection for any particular title he may not find in the undergraduate collection or for whatever additional reading he may wish to do. Furthermore, provision can and should be made for adding new titles to the undergraduate collection and withdrawing outdated ones, thereby keeping the collection up-to-date without increasing the total number of titles.²

The actual number of volumes, as against titles, in the undergraduate collection is another matter. It may be several times the number of titles, depending on the size of the student body and

¹ Unfortunately, translations of foreign works will probably have to be preferred to editions in the original language, although in many instances the latter can also be included to good advantage.

² Current periodicals of a general character should certainly be included. They will, of course, be duplicated in the general periodical room, but those in the undergraduate collection can be kept for a year or two and then discarded, without being bound.

the funds available for buying duplicate copies. There is no inherent evil in duplicates—on the contrary, several copies of one good title are certainly better than the same number of different titles of doubtful value, particularly for undergraduate purposes.

It goes without saying that the books in the undergraduate collection are to be displayed on open shelves where they can be taken down (even if not returned) by the students themselves. Outside circulation should also be permitted whenever practicable, and every effort made to get as far as possible away from the traditional reserve book system with its restriction on the time and place where books are to be read and the oppressive air of supervision that pervades it.

Classification and Cataloguing

The arrangement or classification and the cataloguing of an undergraduate collection of 5000 titles or less presents a totally different problem from the classification and cataloguing of the main university library collection—a problem that cannot be met by the usual classification and cataloguing procedure.

From among the several methods of classification which might be suitable for the undergraduate collection, it would seem desirable to choose a simple one with some inherent educational significance. We should then have to reject at the outset not only such schemes as the Dewey and the Library of Congress, but also the method of grouping books by courses or even departments of instruction, which is now used in most reserve book collections. Whatever the immediate physical convenience of such an arrangement may be, it is certainly educationally misleading. The library can at least try to correct the impression that knowledge is divided into divisions and compartments corresponding to the several academic departments and courses. The student should not be permitted to fall into the habit of considering certain books as belonging to certain “courses,” but should see them in their broader relations.¹

¹ There will, of course, be certain books which are needed for shorter periods and for specific assignments in undergraduate courses, but which do not properly belong in the regular undergraduate collection. These can be transferred temporarily from the main stacks to the undergraduate room and set up by courses in the present manner of reserve books. Similarly, when large numbers of dupli-

(Footnote continued on next page)

Perhaps the principal educationally significant division of a book collection that can be made is the division into primary or original works on the one hand, and secondary, critical, or historical works on the other—the division between the classics, or the books that form the basis of our civilization and culture and have in a sense become ends in themselves, and then the purely informative, useful, and instructive books, that are but means to an end. It is extremely helpful, if not necessary, for the undergraduate student to be constantly reminded that Thucydides' *History* is an original product of Ancient Greece, and a primary work, while Bury's *History of Greece* is a modern work about Ancient Greece, and therefore a secondary work; or that Plato's *Dialogues* are the primary source for the study of Plato's philosophy, and that A. E. Taylor's *Plato* is only a secondary source.¹

Having made this fundamental division, we can proceed to subdivide each group. For the original works a division by subject or form is not only difficult, but involves so many arbitrary decisions that its value is questionable. Instead, a grouping by historical periods has definite educational value. It would then be impossible for the student to be unaware of contemporary developments in various fields while immediately concerned with only one of them. For instance, with the original works of the Elizabethan era arranged together, the student could see at once who Shakespeare's contemporary writers were. The definition or delimitation of historical periods presents some difficulty, since they vary with the point of view. Up to the 16th century, however, broad divisions such as Ancient, Medieval, and Renaissance periods will serve, and beginning with the 16th century a division by centuries is simpler and probably open to no more objections than some other division. The section of original works will then present in rather concrete form a literary and cultural, and in some respects also a political, history of the world. Even to stand before the shelves

cates are needed for certain courses, the bulk of these copies can also be set up by courses, and when the demand for them has passed they can be retired to storage shelves, leaving one or more copies in the undergraduate collection. While we shall thus in a sense have "reserves," these reserves will definitely be supplemental and will not be part of the essential structure of the undergraduate collection.

¹ Some works fall in both categories. For instance, Gibbon's *Decline and Fall* is a primary literary and political work of 18th century England, but at the same time a secondary historical work about Ancient Rome and the early Middle Ages.

and examine the titles on the backs of the books in such an arrangement would not be a waste of time for the undergraduate student.

With regard to the secondary works there is perhaps less to be said for the chronological arrangement than in the case of original works. And yet, it is unquestionably useful to have Bury's *History of Greece* grouped with the other books about the Ancient world. On the other hand, a subject division of the secondary works could be made very simple, with probably no more than twelve classes or divisions. But if we do this we must again guard against any tendency to make the divisions correspond to departments and courses. The best argument, however, for the chronological arrangement for both the primary and the secondary groups is that we shall then be able to place the primary works on the upper shelves around the room and the secondary works on the lower, keeping those that belong to the same period directly above and below each other, thereby increasing the educational significance of the arrangement.¹

Within each chronological period the simplest arrangement is an alphabetical one by author.² And, in addition to the divisions mentioned, a separate section will be needed for "reference" books, dictionaries, encyclopedias, and general compendiums and textbooks.

Cataloguing should definitely be kept at a minimum. An author-title finding list and a shelf list are essential, but the whole paraphernalia of bibliographical description and subject cataloguing should not be brought into the undergraduate library, since not only does it have no educational value for the undergraduate, but it is likely to be actually misleading. For a collection of 5000 titles surely the classification scheme itself and the librarian in charge can provide a much better guide than any subject catalogue.

¹ Thus on the upper shelves of the "Ancient" section we would have the works of Aristophanes, Aristotle, Cicero, Horace, Plato, Thucydides, Virgil, etc.; and on the lower shelves of this section the works of Breasted, Bury, Gibbon, Goodspeed, A. E. Taylor, etc. On the upper shelves of the "Medieval" section we would have the works of Augustine, Justinian, Maimonides, etc.; on the lower shelves the works of Bryce, Coulton, Rashdall, Preserved Smith, etc.; and so on for the subsequent sections.

² The original works could, of course, be arranged in strict chronological order, but this would separate the individual works of an author and could not be applied when several works originally published at different dates are bound together in one volume.

Of course, lists of books recommended by instructors for their courses should be available to students. Too much reliance on such lists, however, would expose the student again to the dangers of the reserve book system. A better aid is the compilation of lists of recommended books on various subjects by a competent librarian in consultation with faculty members.

Reference Service

Reference service in the undergraduate room should be provided by librarians interested in and trained to understand the needs of undergraduates. These reference librarians must be familiar with the undergraduate instructional program and the reading recommended for the various courses, and they must also be able to act as general advisers on undergraduate reading. This reference service can be administratively separate from the technical work of shelving books, charging them out, collecting fines, etc. It should be the basic aim of the reference librarians to make the room not a reserve book room, where assigned reading is done, but an undergraduate reading room where the library materials for a general education are available.

The complete severance of the undergraduate reading room, book collection, catalogue, and reference service from the main reading room, stack collection, catalogue, and reference service of the university library will not only improve the service to undergraduates, but will at the same time enable the library to improve its service to graduates and research workers. The main reading room will then become a research and reference room for advanced students and faculty; the stack collection a genuine research collection, unencumbered by such things as multiple copies of undergraduate textbooks; the main catalogue a real scholarly tool that no longer attempts the impossible feat of being both simple enough for freshmen and complete and comprehensive enough for research workers; reference service to graduates and faculty members will be performed by academically trained librarians who are freed from the task of answering questions for undergraduates. There can be no doubt that each of the two types of service rendered by the university library will improve with their separation.

Once separate library service for undergraduates is inaugurated, the opportunities for bridging the gap between the classroom and the library will be unlimited. Regular series of lectures can be given in the undergraduate room by faculty or library staff members on, say, the growth of the various national literatures, with constant reference to the books themselves as they stand in chronological arrangement on the shelves around the room. The undergraduate library program may also in time make its influence felt on the curriculum—at least it will be more than an incidental factor in the university's undergraduate instructional program.

APPRAISING ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

A Criticism

By HOWARD DYKEMA ROELOFS

University of Cincinnati

Any article, good or bad, given publication in the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors gains a claim to our consideration. When this article deals with so live an issue as the ways in which professorial performance is judged, this claim is enhanced. If such an article turns out to be very bad, these extraneous factors justify, even require, a thoroughgoing criticism of what might otherwise be safely entrusted to oblivion.

Such is the case with the article entitled "The Functional Bases of Appraising Academic Performance" by Logan Wilson in the October, 1941 *Bulletin*. In its title and first paragraph there are ample indications to the discerning of the character of what is to follow. Function is a very important *thing*. But the word "functional" is currently so traded on and abused that its appearance in a title should put us on the watch. The short first paragraph uses "scientific attitude," "wishful thinking," "analytic study" and finally "realistic functional." These particular question-begging epithets are symptomatic of a common modern sickness, verbal pretensions to science without the performance. Yet symptoms are only suggestions of what to look for. Let us look.

II

Mr. Wilson is chiefly concerned with the relative importance of teaching and research not simply in determining academic preference, but in the effective performance of the academic job. Like any investigator he employs criteria to select and differentiate his primary data. Are his basic criteria adequate to the material to which they are applied and for the purposes in hand? On page 445 he uses figures regarding publications as equivalent both posi-

tively and negatively to measures of research activity. "The actual situation [few or no publications] proves that the research function tends to become residual, and is not participated in extensively." His selective criteria, therefore, are no more than these. Publication equals research; absence of publication equals absence of research. These criteria are both faulty and inadequate. The assumption that all contributions to "the printed literature" are products of research is one of those familiar polite fictions which it would be almost intolerable to do without. But a competent investigator does not use a white lie as a valid criterion. The assumed negative equivalence, that no publication equals no research, is an even worse error. First, it is simply false: there is a good deal of sound scholarship and genuine research which does not run to publication. Second, the interaction of teaching and research is ignored. Particularly in nonscientific fields, a normal result of good scholarship is not the establishment of a neat fact, a result easily chronicled in a research report, but rather a broadened and corrected understanding of an author, a movement, a philosophy. The enrichment of teaching, not publication, is the consummation of such research. This result is not a static affair, as is the case with a printed article, but a living, continuous process, involving scholar, subject matter, and students, growing with the years. A doctrinaire separation of teaching and research ignores this type of interaction, but it is both real and important. Further, this fruitful union of research and teaching, even if publication does not occur, has an unhappy contrast. Pressure to publish drives many members of our profession into pseudo-research and the neglect or perversion of their teaching. Mr. Wilson refers to the maladjustment which occurs when a man with a native gift for research finds himself in an institution where the primary emphasis is on teaching, and *vice versa*. His remedy is for the man to change his job. Such people do exist and the remedy for them, if they can employ it, is the one given. But all this is relevant only to teaching and research as separated, independent activities. Frequently a single person unites the capacity and the desire to do both. The beneficent results of this interaction of teaching and research, even when there is no publication, and the baneful effects on both which can come from pressure to print are

familiar to all academic people. Notable instances are among the commonplaces of faculty conversation. Yet Mr. Wilson's article ignores these facts as completely as if he were totally ignorant of them.

The actual facts are indeed more complex than can be handled by Mr. Wilson's two criteria. Yet he might offer a defense. He might contend that his criteria are good enough because quantitatively they catch the bulk of the instances, and that the cases I have cited as falling outside his criteria are numerically insignificant. Even if this were true, such a defense augments the offense. The importance of the groups he ignores is not a function of their numbers but of their nature. The exclusive reliance on simple quantitative discriminations is an increasingly serious evil in the very field Mr. Wilson is investigating. He exemplifies a practice he should be criticizing.

III

There are other inaccuracies in procedure in this article which merit notice. Mr. Wilson divides all institutions of higher learning into three groups, as they give dominant emphasis to teaching, to research, or to both. He then equates each class, thus defined, with other factors, size, areas in which there is competition for students, attitude towards technical incompetence among staff members, etc. This classification is more notable for structural simplicity, chiefly verbal, than for adequacy to the facts. He next offers three sources of evidence to demonstrate the fate of research in institutions where teaching receives chief emphasis. The first refers specifically to "smaller colleges"; the second to "various types of colleges and universities"; the third to those "1888 persons in the United States who took the Ph.D. in mathematics between 1862 and 1933," with not a word as to where they taught, or even that they taught at all. Clearly these three sets of data do not refer in the same sense to any single set of institutions. Yet Mr. Wilson says, "These figures indicate that . . . in the typical college or smaller university . . .," just as if these data did refer to a single class (p. 445).

At times one is almost ready to hope that other parts of this

article are as incorrect as the examples just given, for certainly some of the things cited are pretty bad. What is one to think when one reads that at the University of Minnesota "the factors entering into promotions . . . were in the following order of importance: 'teaching, 43.4 per cent; productive scholarship, 27.6 per cent; student counseling, 11.6 per cent; administrative work, 11 per cent; and public service, 6.4 per cent'" (p. 446)? I, for one, hope this is another mistake on the part of Mr. Wilson. But if it is not an error in reporting, if at any university there is the delusion that this rating of factors in percentages is a reliable procedure, then the existence of that delusion is a scandal. The procedure and the delusion arising from it deserve not simple recording but exposure and condemnation. The same applies to the attitude alleged to be dominant at the University of Michigan, where, we are told, the greater emphasis on research in the matter of promotions is "in part explained by the fact that productiveness in research affords more 'tangible results' than in teaching." With my own personal sense of the tremendous debt I owe to such Michigan instructors as Wenley, Lloyd, and Cooley, and the knowledge I have of how other Michigan graduates think of these men and of many others, the puzzle arises, or the shame, as to what some people now at Michigan mean by "tangible."

IV

We hear a great deal these days about higher education, of whether it can or should be continued during the war, of what it is and should be attempting. No education can be better than those who provide it; every university finds its measure in its faculty. How these are chosen, retained, promoted is of vital concern not only to us but to all citizens. And towards the close of his article Mr. Wilson gives indications that he realizes some of the chief evils already operative in determining promotions. This makes the errors in this article the more lamentable. Emphasis on teaching in the social service sense, without inspiration or enlightenment from scholarship and research, is as bad as pseudo-research, with publication on a mass production, count the pages, basis. Both are prevalent. Certainly, as Mr. Wilson says, these and

other factors currently involved in estimating academic performance, need to be ascertained and made known, not after the fashion of mere hoping for Utopia, but for what they are. But this work of investigation must itself be accurate. And with the facts established let there also be judgment.

Mr. Wilson's article is too faulty in its methods to be reliable. Yet the *Bulletin* gave it currency and standing. The *Bulletin* and Mr. Wilson now owe us something really good on this important subject.¹

¹ The *Bulletin* seeks to bring to its readers articles, reports and communications concerning various aspects of academic affairs. but as indicated in a letter to the author it does not endorse all the articles published. The *Bulletin* welcomes correction and comment at all times.—THE EDITOR.

AN ADVENTURE IN COLLEGE GOVERNMENT¹

The Union Faculty Writes a Constitution

By HAROLD A. LARRABEE

Union College

On October 1, 1941, just about two months before Pearl Harbor, the Union faculty adopted a new constitution to expedite its legislative activities. After being accepted by the Trustees "in principle and for trial," and after having been revised in the light of this year's experience with its provisions, it has just been ratified and is now the law of the college. To which information any alumnus might be forgiven for making the very American rejoinder of "So What?" Faculties are always trying to make things over: the world, the country, the college, or at least themselves. Academic schemes of organization have an extremely high birth rate, and almost as high a rate of infant mortality. Why suppose that this latest manifestation of the urge-to-legislate will prove to be any more significant or long-lived than its many predecessors?

Now it may be just blind and incurable optimism on the part of some of us to suggest that the new constitution is something which, coming just at this time, should give every Union alumnus a feeling of pride in the strength and institutional vitality of the college. Everyone is talking about making democracy work, about keeping it alive in a world that is organizing for violence, not persuasion. We are engaged in a contest for the survival of a way of life—a mode of existence that happens to call for more skill and good will than any other. The college is at one and the same time the custodian of some of the most precious values of that way of life, and a training ground for their perpetuation and enhancement. Should it not, therefore, set an example, in its own internal government, of the sort of group living-together which we are trying to preserve? If a college faculty cannot make democracy effective

¹ Reprinted from the *Union Alumni Monthly*, Vol. XXXI, No. 6, July-August, 1942.

in its own affairs, have its members any business recommending it to their students, much less to the world at large? And if they cannot, as educated leaders, summon the necessary ingenuity and forbearance to work out decisions by persuasion, who can?

It was thoughts like the above which kept a subcommittee at work through the hot weather of last summer in answer to the challenge of the Committee to Study the College, which had recommended the reorganization of the former Curriculum Committee by the setting up of a legislative body with broader powers and responsibilities. The principal weaknesses of the Curriculum Committee as a federal body representing the four divisions of the college were two: its members met as delegates of their divisions, so that no one except the administrative officers felt any direct responsibility for the welfare of the college as a whole; and legislative measures could originate only in a division, thus bearing the taint of factional interest, even though they might be sincerely directed toward the general good.

The first steps were in the direction of fact-finding; and here the pathway was somewhat smoothed for us in advance by the labors of the Committee on Place and Function of Faculties of the American Association of University Professors. That committee had surveyed the faculty organization plans of no less than 332 colleges and universities, of which 26 were found to have printed faculty constitutions. Of these latter, about ten furnished us with useful suggestions, although no one of them had anything like the answer to our particular problem. The subcommittee also discovered some of the legal complications inherent in what Dr. Waldron calls our "18th century charter" which vests overwhelming powers in the Trustees. But fortunately no one seemed to enter upon the undertaking in a spirit of legalism. In looking back over the enterprise, nothing is more striking than what President Fox called the atmosphere of "generous reasonableness" which prevailed throughout.

In the actual drafting of the new organic law, two main assumptions guided those who were trying to reconcile democracy and efficiency in the government of the college. The first was that the great bulk of the educational measures passed by any faculty, if they are to be effective, have to be carried by large majorities.

Since morale is of such transcendent importance in education, teachers have to be persuaded in advance, and not coerced by dictation. The second principle, closely related to the first, was that most educational changes come about slowly after prolonged study and debate. These two considerations pointed toward a form of faculty government which was geared to leisurely study and unanimous (or nearly unanimous) action. But at the same time it was recognized that some votes are close, and that crises sometimes arise in which swift and decisive action is necessary, so that provision must be made for meeting emergencies upon a somewhat different basis. To combine the two in a single document under the shadow of impending war was not an easy task.

The heart of the new plan, which is built solidly upon the divisional system yet has a college-wide basis, is the Faculty Council of seventeen members (representing the 80 members of the faculty), in which is vested all the legislative power which the faculty possesses. The President, the Dean, and the chairmen of the four divisions are ex-officio members. Three members are chosen from the faculty at large; and the other eight are elected by the divisions, two from each. To insure rotation in office, at the end of the term of an elected member, which runs for two years, he is ineligible for re-election until a full year has elapsed.

The Faculty Council, which meets every month, and oftener if needed, may receive proposals relating to the educational work of the college from any one of a large number of sources: the trustees, the president, any division, any faculty member, or any student. In the ordinary course of business, no proposal is finally acted upon at the meeting at which it is introduced, but is referred to all interested parties through the divisions for discussion and the submission of advisory opinions. At the next Council meeting, however, it may be voted upon, and if it receives a two-thirds majority of the Council (ruled to be twelve votes), it becomes law unless vetoed by the President in writing, when it goes to the Trustees for final disposition. If any proposal receives a majority but not a two-thirds vote, it may be submitted to a General Meeting of the whole faculty, where a majority vote decides its fate. Three of such General Meetings are held during each academic year.

In an emergency, however, a proposal can be passed immediately, provided fewer than three members of the Council object to emergency consideration, and two-thirds vote in its favor. It is believed that this method provides a means of expediting emergency measures at the same time that it safeguards minority opinion. The aim of all these provisions is to give every one who is vitally interested in any measure the maximum opportunity to be heard that is compatible with vigorous affirmative action.

"The men of Massachusetts," it is sometimes said, "could make any form of government work." Certainly no scheme is any better, in actual practice, than the people who operate it. No one connected with the Council regards it as a panacea for all our educational ills. Its first year of operation has been a baptism of fire never anticipated by its designers. Time alone will show whether it will be consumed or tempered by the heat of battle. Like all instruments, the new constitution can be used to obstruct and obfuscate as well as for constructive purposes. But the great potential value of written rules of procedure is in lessening personal friction by keeping the eyes of an assembly on the problems and not on each other.

The central principle of democracy is sometimes stated thus: that those who take the consequences of decisions should have a share in making them. That is not an easy principle for a college to live by in the midst of a world-wide war. The Trustees and President of any educational institution must be severely tempted to centralize and concentrate authority in order to meet the fateful responsibilities of the present hour. Rule by fiat is the easy method. It is greatly to the credit of Union's leaders that they have not only resisted the lure of any such methods, but have encouraged a bold advance in the other direction.

PROBLEMS OF THE PROFESSORiate¹

By RALPH E. HIMSTEAD

American Association of University Professors

I am happy to have the opportunity to participate in this symposium on the subject, "Problems Facing American Education," and to speak as a representative of the American Association of University Professors. I assume that what is desired of each participant is a statement and brief discussion of some educational problem or problems of special concern to the organization on whose behalf he speaks.

Basic in the philosophy of the American Association of University Professors is the belief that the ultimate purpose of an educational institution is to bring teachers and students together in an environment conducive to the learning process; that almost everything else in education is supplementary and subordinate to this purpose and designed only to facilitate its accomplishment; that teaching is a profession; that teachers are a part of the institution on whose faculty they serve; and that the relationship between teachers, presidents, deans, and trustees is that of associates in the furtherance of a joint enterprise for the common good. Much of the Association's activity has been motivated by a desire, and planned, to develop and to strengthen this professional concept of college and university teaching.

A serious problem in American education today is presented by the failure of some college and university administrative officers and some trustees to recognize that teachers *are* associates in the significant task of educating youth and by the failure of many teachers to accept the duties and the responsibilities which are inherent in this relationship. Teachers should be encouraged to participate in the consideration of educational policies and should be made to

¹ Paper presented at the Twenty-fifth Annual Meeting of the American Council on Education in Chicago, Illinois on May 2, 1942 as one of seven brief papers in a symposium on "Problems Facing American Education." The texts of these papers were published in *The Educational Record*, July, 1942, Vol. XXIII, No. 3.

feel a responsibility for the welfare of the institution of which they are a part and for the whole of education. The failure on the part of some administrative officers and some teachers to recognize the professional concept of teaching is, in my opinion, not only short-sighted and unwise as regards education but inimical to the welfare of our democratic institutions. The preclusion of teachers from any real freedom of thought, of inquiry, and of expression, and from any real voice in the determination of educational policies is particularly unwise at this time of crisis when these freedoms are needed more than ever before in the preparation of our youth for leadership in the crucial years that lie ahead.

This problem is not of recent origin nor is the American Association of University Professors the only organization which has sought to cope with it. It has long been recognized by many able college and university administrators and by several influential educational associations: notably, the Association of American Colleges, the American Council on Education, the Association of American Universities, the American Association of University Women, and the several regional accrediting agencies. These associations have all cooperated in seeking recognition of the professional concept of teaching and of the concomitant "associates" or "partnership" concept of the faculty-administration relationship. May I call your attention to the latest expression of opinion on this subject, the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure formulated and agreed upon by representatives of the Association of American Colleges and of the American Association of University Professors. This statement now has the official endorsement of these two Associations and of the American Association of Teachers Colleges. The principles set forth in the statement have also received the endorsement of the Association of American Law Schools. The following significant passages are from the introduction to the 1940 Statement:

The purpose of this statement is to promote public understanding and support of academic freedom and tenure and agreement upon procedures to assure them in colleges and universities. Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher or

the institution as a whole. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition.

Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning. It carries with it duties correlative with rights.

Tenure is a means to certain ends; specifically: (1) freedom of teaching and research and of extramural activities, and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Freedom and economic security, hence tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society.

How to bring about more extensive observance of these principles which are essential to the welfare of education and society is a question that should receive the careful consideration of all who are interested in or are a part of our colleges and universities: citizens, trustees, administrative officers, and teachers.

The war has brought new and difficult problems to colleges and universities, in the consideration and solution of which it is desirable to have bona fide faculty-administration cooperation. There is the matter of the temporary loss to the institution of valuable teachers who will be called to the armed services of the country or who may wish to engage in services of national import, military or otherwise. This presents the problem of leaves of absence for these teachers while they are engaged in the war effort. There is the matter of acceleration of instructional programs and ways and means of inaugurating them. There is the matter of possible curtailment of income because of war conditions which may necessitate financial rearrangements and changes in staff assignments. At institutions where the professional concept of teaching is recognized and observed, the administration and the faculty together are determining the nature and the extent of the adjustments necessitated by the war and the methods by which they can best be accomplished. At such institutions the methods adopted are, for the most part, consonant with the highest professional standards and best

academic procedures. They are of such a nature that the ensuing sacrifices do not fall unduly upon any one group within the institution.

Unfortunately, such a happy state of affairs does not prevail at all institutions. At some, changes of policy which profoundly affect faculty and institutional welfare have been announced and inaugurated without any faculty consultation. For example, acceleration programs have been announced at some institutions without any faculty consultation, requiring members of the faculty to serve without compensation during summer sessions which vary in length from one-fourth to one-third of a year. Such disregard of the faculty in reaching decisions concerning educational and institutional policies is not in accord with good academic practice. It can be justified only if we regard teachers as employees and, as such, as persons whose welfare and wishes need not be considered. This attitude toward employees has, incidentally, long since been discarded in the business and the industrial world.

On the point of the relation between acceleration and faculty compensation, I wish to bring to your attention the views of a university administrator as expressed in a letter to me under date of January 23, 1942. The pertinent excerpts from this letter are as follows:

I suppose that most of the fears and worries that are expressed to you come from members of the teaching staff. You are now about to get one expressed by an administrator. . . .

Now from one end of the country to the other colleges and universities are announcing either longer summer sessions or in some instances summer sessions where previously none had been given. . . .

Any such proposal immediately introduces financial considerations. I am not clear how large a number of students are going to be able to study on an eleven-month basis which will inevitably deprive them of earning possibilities by means of which they have hitherto financed themselves during the regular academic year.

Important as this consideration is, and I am certain that many institutions will find that it is more important than they have thought, there is another aspect of the problem that concerns me more. I refer to the matter of compensation to staff members for

the additional work that is to be called for as a result of the accelerated program and lengthened summer sessions.

I have recently seen a statement from the office of a president of one large institution which indicates that the administration will regard it as the "duty" of staff members to give two and one-half semesters of service each year instead of the customary two. I have heard several college administrators express in rather vigorous terms the idea that, if they lengthened their summer sessions or introduced summer sessions, they would expect the members of the staff to give the additional service without extra compensation or at some greatly reduced rate. . . .

I do not think it at all unpatriotic to suggest that there is something wrong in asking college professors to give additional services at lower rates of pay merely because the country is at war. The net result of all this is to undermine salary standards, and we all know that for most members of the teaching profession, the salary scale is pitifully low now. . . .

I do not believe that colleges should be financed by an appeal to patriotism. I say this because of my sincere belief that all forms of pressure that have a tendency to undermine professional standards, including salary standards, should be resisted. That is why I look with most disfavor upon what seems to be the tendency of having the accelerated college program financed by the free services of staff members who are already between the devil and the deep sea and not in a position to speak individually in protest.

The viewpoints expressed in the letter from which I have quoted should, in my opinion, receive the careful consideration of all college and university administrators. To require teachers to serve during the summer quarter or semester without compensation is not, in my opinion, professionally desirable nor do I believe that it can be justified as an emergency measure. If subsequent events make salary reductions necessary, I am confident that faculty members will cooperate cheerfully for the common good. Such reductions, however, should be proportional in nature, equitably graduated and made applicable to teachers and administrative officers alike.

In conclusion, I wish to speak briefly regarding a related problem, namely, that of maintaining good faculty morale. Good faculty morale, always essential to the welfare of an educational institution, is particularly so at this time. Some college and uni-

versity administrations may seek to meet anticipated financial exigencies due to the war by dismissing members of the faculty. Teachers who may thus be selected for dismissal may have given years of able and loyal service to the institution and may have reached an age at which professional relocation is difficult. Some of them may have specialized in subjects regarded as purely cultural, such as Latin and Greek, for which the present demand is not great. In the case of some contemplated dismissals, the financial exigency may not be the real reason. Unwarranted dismissals of teachers or intimations of possible future dismissals are powerful depressants of faculty morale which impair the quality of teaching and research to the detriment of the whole of the institution. A proper regard for the place and the function of teachers in an educational institution and the recognition and observance of the partnership concept of the faculty-administration relationship will obviate any unnecessary institutional dislocation destructive of good faculty morale.

The financial situation of some institutions may become precarious as a result of the war. If so, dismissals from the faculty should be sought only as a last resort after every effort has been made to meet the need in other ways. If a college or university administration values good faculty morale, it will do all in its power during the war to respect academic tenure and to maintain the salaries of the members of the faculty at an adequate level.

It is possible and probable that financial exigencies will not be as serious as at first thought as a result of the war, that there will be no oversupply of college and university teachers. More and more teachers are leaving their posts to join the armed forces of the nation or to enter other services vital to the prosecution of the war. It is possible that student enrollment may not shrink to the extent at first feared. It is possible that there may, in fact, be a shortage of college and university teachers, as there is now a shortage of teachers in secondary schools, and that we shall find ourselves faced with a new problem, the recruitment of teaching personnel. Unless the war brings about the destruction of our colleges and universities or great diminution in their number, we shall most certainly face a problem of teacher recruitment in the years following the war. These possibilities and probabilities with

reference to the supply of college and university teachers constitute another persuasive reason for cooperative action between administrative officers and teachers in reaching decisions affecting educational and institutional policies for the future.

ASSOCIATION NEWS

Twenty-ninth Annual Meeting

December 28-29, 1942

Because of necessary wartime restrictions on civilian travel there was until recently great doubt whether educational associations could hold general meetings this year. A recent ruling of the Office of Defense Transportation, however, indicates that such meetings may be planned subject to possible emergency cancellation.

Careful consideration to the matter of holding meetings of scientific and learned societies during the war has been given by the Science Committee. This committee, advisory to the National Resources Planning Board, is composed of members designated by the National Research Council, the American Council on Education, the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council. In a statement prepared by the Committee and issued on August 20, 1942, there are these pertinent passages:

In view of the fact that the present emergency calls for the greatest mobilization of scientists, scholars, and educators in the history of the United States, it is clear that the societies and associations into which they are organized have an important part in the war effort. This part includes not only direct participation by scientists, technologists, scholars, and others in war activities, but also the discussion of present and future problems and the maintenance of a vigorous intellectual life. There are no fields of knowledge which are not affected and which have not some contribution to make.

.....

The Science Committee suggests, therefore, that each society or association should consider the relationship which its field or discipline bears to the war effort, and the contribution that it can make, and that it should plan the program of its meeting with this relation or contribution in view; not overlooking, however, the im-

portance of giving consideration to the post-war period, nor the necessity of maintaining such activities as contribute to a strong national intellectual life.

The 1942 Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors is, therefore, being planned. It will be held in Cleveland, Ohio, on Monday and Tuesday, December 28 and 29, in connection with the meetings of the Allied Social Science Associations.¹ The headquarters for the meeting will be at the Hotel Cleveland.

The general meeting will be preceded by a session of the Council of the Association on the afternoon of December 27 or on the morning of December 28, and will be followed by sessions of the Council on December 30. The Annual Dinner of the Association will be held on Monday evening, December 28, at seven o'clock.

In addition to the regular Association business, of which there are several particularly important items, the program will stress subjects pertaining to the rôle of higher education in the war and in the post-war years. The program for the meeting will be published in the December *Bulletin*. If possible, the program will be sent to chapter officers for presentation to chapters prior to December publication.

It is possible that the meeting this year will be the last Annual Meeting of the Association until after the war. It is particularly desirable, therefore, that this meeting be as representative as possible of the membership and the chapters. Members who plan to be in attendance should keep in mind the ever-increasing difficulty of handling civilian travel, the difficulty of securing accommodations, the delays in train schedules and misconnections, and should make their travel reservations well in advance of the meeting.

¹ American Accounting Association, American Association for Labor Legislation, American Association of University Teachers of Insurance, American Business Law Association, American Economic Association, American Farm Economic Association, American Finance Association, American Marketing Association, American Sociological Society, American Statistical Association, Econometric Society, Institute of Mathematical Statistics, Rural Sociological Society.

The Associate Secretaryship

On September 15, 1942 Robert Phillips Ludlum became Associate Secretary of the Association. His appointment was made pursuant to Council action on the nomination of the General Secretary. He succeeds Dr. Thomas Fitzgerald Green, Jr., who requested release early in June to accept a position with the Office of Price Administration in Atlanta, Georgia.

Dr. Ludlum was born in 1909. He holds the A.B. (1930), M.A. (1932), and Ph.D. (1935) degrees from Cornell University. He was married in 1930 to Ruth Althea Smith, daughter of the late Dean Emeritus and Mrs. Albert W. Smith of Cornell University. His doctoral dissertation was entitled, "Joshua R. Giddings, Anti-Slavery Radical." He has been a contributor to *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, *The Journal of Negro History*, and *The Dictionary of American History*. In 1939-1940 while on leave from his teaching duties he was research associate on the project of the General Education Board on "Methods of Teaching High School Students to Think Critically About Social Issues." He is a member of the American Historical Association and of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association.

From 1935 to 1940 Dr. Ludlum was first Instructor and later Assistant Professor of History at the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas. From 1940-1942 he was Assistant Professor of History and Political Science at Hofstra College, from which position he is now on leave of absence. During the summer of 1942 he was assistant to the chief of the Planning Section, Division of Surveys, of the Bureau of Intelligence in the Office of War Information.

Dr. Ludlum was Secretary of the Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College chapter of the Association in 1937-1938 and President in 1938-1939. He was President of the Hofstra College chapter during the academic year 1940-1941. In the work of the Association, he has demonstrated genuine understanding of its principles and philosophy.

Regional Meetings

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

On the initiative of the University of Pittsburgh chapter of the American Association of University Professors, a regional conference for members of the Association at institutions in Western Pennsylvania, sponsored by the chapters of the University of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania College for Women, and Carnegie Institute of Technology, was held on Saturday, April 11, 1942, in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. In attendance at the conference were eighty-five members and guests from California State Teachers College, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Mount Mercy College, Pennsylvania College for Women, Pennsylvania State College, University of Pittsburgh, Seton Hill College, and Washington and Jefferson College.

The first session, held in the Cathedral of Learning of the University of Pittsburgh under the Chairmanship of Professor B. C. Dennison of Carnegie Institute of Technology, was devoted to a discussion of "Activities of Local Chapters." Some of the problems confronting their respective chapters were outlined by Professor Nita Butler of Pennsylvania College for Women, Professor James Porter of Carnegie Institute of Technology, Professor John B. Rollit of Seton Hill College, and Professor F. J. Tschan of Pennsylvania State College.

Following this session the chapter of Pennsylvania College for Women was host to the participants in the conference at a tea held in Mellon Hall, the former home of Andrew W. Mellon, recently presented to the college as a dormitory and social center. After the tea the second session was called to order by Professor M. M. Owens, Chairman, of Pennsylvania College for Women, who introduced the general subject for discussion, "Educational Problems in Wartime." Problems in connection with "Defense Training Courses in the Colleges" were presented in a paper by Dr. Herbert L. Spencer, President of Pennsylvania College for Women. Professor W. George Crouch, a member of the Morale Committee of the University of Pittsburgh, spoke on the subject, "War Morale and Information Centers in the Colleges." Professor Martin P.

Chworowsky of Carnegie Institute of Technology presented a paper entitled, "A Philosophy of Education for Now and Later."

The evening session of the conference was a dinner meeting held in the Faculty Club in the Cathedral of Learning of the University of Pittsburgh at which Professor D. D. Lessenberry of the University of Pittsburgh was the toastmaster. The principal speaker of the evening was Dr. Ralph E. Himstead, General Secretary of the Association, who spoke on the subject, "Our Association in These Times." Drawing his materials from the official files of the Association with reference to situations in which the Association has functioned, he explained with clarity and interest the quiet and unpublicized rôle of the Association in promoting better faculty-administration relations and in helping to create an institutional atmosphere conducive to intellectual freedom. In the course of his address he spoke specifically of the impact of the war on higher education and indicated several dangers which call for vigilance on the part of college and university teachers.

Chapter Activities

Hofstra College. On May 6, 1942 the Hofstra College chapter of the Association held its second annual dinner meeting to which were invited the chapters and members from nearby institutions. Members and guests were present from Adelphi College, Brooklyn College, Queens College, and New York Medical College. About fifty persons were in attendance. Dr. Ralph E. Himstead, General Secretary of the Association, was guest of honor and principal speaker.

Professor Milton H. Williams, President of the Hofstra College chapter, served as toastmaster, and introduced Dr. Himstead who spoke informally on some of the activities of the Association in peace and war. He illustrated portions of his remarks with details of some of the situations involving issues of academic freedom and tenure and professional ethics which had recently come to the attention of the Association.

REPORT OF THE 1942 NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The Nominating Committee for the year 1942 consists of Walter G. Cady (Physics), Wesleyan University; William M. Hepburn (Law), University of Alabama; and Victor D. Hill (Classical Languages), Ohio University, *Chairman*. The list of nominees is a part of this report, which is being published in the October and December issues of the *Bulletin* as well as upon the official ballot for the twenty-ninth Annual Meeting of the Association.

The problems of the Nominating Committee, difficult at best, were further complicated this year by the fact that many members of the Association have left their teaching positions to enter the armed forces or some other special form of service to our country. The Committee has, however, endeavored to handle its task with the greatest of care, and it is with no little satisfaction that this list of nominees is submitted.

The Committee met in Washington on June 4. In January the General Secretary had mailed a form to each member of the Association, requesting suggestions for nominations as provided in By-Law 1. The members of the Committee each received an organized list of the suggestions thus provided and were able to study it before the Committee met. These data included 245 different names, proposed by 283 persons, and ranged all the way from 12 names in District I to 36 in District VII. This list was supplemented by data from the committee of the preceding year and from other sources and available records. In particular, confidential inquiry was made as widely as possible among other members of the Association.¹

The 22 nominees here presented² have, therefore, been named

¹ By-Law 1 provides that "In carrying on its work the Committee shall seek advice from members of the Association."

² Normally there are 20 nominations to the Council each year. The additional two are to provide for a successor to Arthur L. Keith, University of South Dakota, whose death cut short his first year of service on the Council. Since the President and Vice-Presidents of the Association were elected in 1941 for two years, these nominees to the Council make up the entire list this year.

on the basis of all the information the Committee found it possible to secure from the considerable mass of information thus assembled. A reasonable distribution in regard "to fields of professional interest, types of institutions"¹ and the inclusion of well-qualified women was also sought in the selection of the nominees. In presenting this list of nominees, arranged by districts, the Committee desires to recall to the membership that the election this year, under the newly amended Constitution, is to be by a proportional vote in accord with the membership of the several chapters, as provided in Article X.² Although the nominees are evenly distributed by districts, all elections are made by vote covering the whole Association and each member of the Council serves, not just the district in which he resides, but the entire Association.

In presenting this report the Committee desires to add for itself and on behalf of the Association as a whole this expression of gratitude to these nominees. They are not "candidates." These persons were chosen by unanimous agreement of the Committee, and their names appear here at the urging of the Committee for service which they may be able to render to the Association.

VICTOR D. HILL, *Chairman*

Nominees for the Council, 1943-1945³

DISTRICT I

GEORGE B. FRANKLIN, English, Boston University

Elected 1924;⁴ Chap. Secy.-Treas., 1934-37; Com. on Organization and Conduct of Chapters, 1939-

Born 1877. A.B., 1903, University of Georgia; A.M., 1913, Ph.D., 1921, Harvard University. Instructor, 1908-12, Georgia School of Technology; Instructor, 1914-16, Simmons College; Assistant Professor, 1916-18, Colby College; educational work with A. E. F., 1918-19; Professor, 1919-24, Evansville College; Associate Professor, 1924-29, Professor, 1929-, Boston University.

¹ In accord with By-Law 1.

² February, 1942 *Bulletin*, pp. 119, 122.

³ One from each district to be elected.

⁴ Refers in this and each following statement to the date of election to Association membership.

OTTO F. KRAUSHAAR, Philosophy, Smith College

Elected 1933; Chap. Secy. and Acting Chap. Pres., 1935-36; Chap. Pres. 1936-37; Chap. Exec. Com., 1936-40.

Born 1901. A.B., 1924, A.M., 1927, State University of Iowa; Ph.D., 1933, Harvard University. High school principal, 1924-26; Assistant, 1927-29, Instructor, 1930-33, Harvard University and Radcliffe College; Visiting Assistant Professor, 1929-30, University of Kansas; Visiting Lecturer, 1935-36, Amherst College; Assistant Professor, 1933-36, Associate Professor, 1936-39, Professor, 1939- , Smith College.

DISTRICT II

HARRY KURZ, Romance Languages, Queens College

Elected 1921; Chap. Pres., 1942- .

Born 1889; B.A., 1909, The City College (New York); M.A., 1911, Ph.D., 1916, Columbia University. Tutor, 1909-16, The City College (New York); Assistant Professor, 1918-20, Carleton College; Professor, 1920-21, University of South Dakota; Professor and Head of Department, 1921-34, Knox College; Professor and Head of Department, 1934-38, University of Nebraska; Associate Professor, 1938- , Queens College.

H. VAN RENSSELAER WILSON, Philosophy, Brooklyn College

Elected 1935; Chap. Secy. 1938- .

Born 1900; A.B., 1921, Oberlin College; B.D., 1926, Chicago Theological Seminary; Ph.D., 1932, University of Chicago. Teacher, 1921-23, Cazenovia Seminary; Minister, 1925-28, Brainerd Community Church, Chicago, Ill.; Professor of Philosophy, 1930-32, College of the Ozarks; Associate Professor, 1933-35, Vassar College; Instructor, 1935- , Brooklyn College.

DISTRICT III

HAROLD A. LARRABEE, Philosophy, Union College

Elected 1926; Chap. Pres., 1937-38.

Born 1894. A.B., 1916, Ph.D., 1925, Harvard University; M.A., 1918, Columbia University. Assistant Professor, 1920-21, Syracuse University; Assistant, 1921-23, Harvard and Radcliffe Colleges; Rogers Traveling Fellow, 1923-24, Harvard University; Assistant Professor, 1924-25, University of Vermont; Assistant Professor, 1925-27, Associate Professor, 1927-28, Professor, 1928- , Union College.

MARY H. SWINDLER, Classical Archaeology, Bryn Mawr College

Elected 1920. .

Born 1884. A.B., 1905, A.M., 1906, LL.D., 1941, Indiana University; Ph.D.,

1912, Bryn Mawr College. Reader, 1912-16, Instructor, 1916-21, Associate, 1921-25, Associate Professor, 1925-31, Professor, 1931- , Bryn Mawr College; Visiting Professor, 1938, American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

DISTRICT IV

LUCIUS GASTON MOFFATT, Romance Languages, University of Virginia

Elected 1930; Chap. Secy.-Treas., 1934-37; Chap. Pres., 1937-38.

Born 1899. A.B., 1921, Litt.D., 1939, Erskine College; M.A., 1928, Ph.D., 1929, Harvard University. Instructor, 1922-24, Clemson College; Instructor, 1928-29, Harvard University; Associate Professor, 1929-37, Professor and Chairman of Department, 1937-40, Syracuse University; Professor and Head of School of Romance Languages, 1940- , University of Virginia.

RICHARD J. PURCELL, History, Catholic University of America

Elected 1930; Chap. Pres., 1938-41; Editorial Committee, 1942- .

Born 1887. B.A., 1910, M.A., 1911, University of Minnesota; Ph.D., 1916, Yale University; LL.B., 1939, Georgetown University. Head of Department of History and Government, 1916-20, College of St. Thomas; Instructor, 1920-22, Associate Professor, 1922-29, Professor, 1929- , Head of Department, 1931- , Catholic University of America; Guggenheim Fellow, 1927-28.

DISTRICT V

LELAND J. GORDON, Economics, Denison University

Elected 1931; Chap. Pres., 1933-35.

Born 1897. B.S., 1922, M.A., 1924, Ph.D., 1928, University of Pennsylvania. Instructor, 1922-29, Assistant Director of Admissions, 1927-30, Assistant Professor, 1931, University of Pennsylvania; Special Lecturer, 1927-29, Haverford College; Penfield Traveling Fellow, 1929-30; Professor and Head of Department, 1931- , Denison University.

FRANCIS EARL RAY, Chemistry, University of Cincinnati

Elected 1930. Chap. Secy., 1935; Chap. Pres., 1937-38.

Born 1898. B.Sc., 1921, D.Sc., 1931, Oxford University; M.A., 1926, University of Illinois. High school teaching, 1921-26; Research Assistant, 1926-27, University of Illinois; Instructor, 1927-30, Grinnell College; Assistant Professor, 1931- , University of Cincinnati.

DISTRICT VI

THOMAS FITZGERALD GREEN, JR., Law, University of Georgia¹

Elected 1932; Chap. Pres., 1938-39; Associate Secretary, 1941-42.

Born 1903. A.B., 1925, LL.B., 1927, University of Georgia; J.S.D., 1931, University of Chicago. Tutor, 1925-26, Associate Professor, 1929-32, Professor, 1932- , University of Georgia.

E. L. LIVELY, Sociology, Fairmont State Teachers College

Elected 1930; Chap. Pres., 1930-41.

Born 1880. Marshall College, 1906; B.S., 1912, West Virginia University; A.M., 1920, Ohio State University. Elementary schools, 1900-04; Principal, Junior High School, 1906-09; High School, 1910-11; Professor and Head of Department, 1912- , Fairmont State Teachers College.

DISTRICT VII

Charles O. LEE, Pharmacy, Purdue University

Elected 1920; Chap. Secy., 1932-33; Chap. Pres., 1937-39.

Born 1883. Attended Baker University, 1908-10; B.S., 1913, University of Kansas; M.S., 1917, University of Chicago; Ph.D., 1930, University of Wisconsin. Teacher, 1913-15, Medical College of Virginia; Professor, 1915-20, 1926- , Purdue University. Pharmacist, 1920-23, Acting Superintendent, 1922-23, General Hospital, Wuhu, China; Professor, 1923-25, University of Nanking; in charge of dispensary, 1925-26, University of Wisconsin.

E. W. McDIARMID, Library Science, University of Illinois

Elected 1935; Chap. Secy.-Treas., 1939- .

Born 1909. A.B., 1929, A.M., 1930, Texas Christian University; A.B. in Lib. Sci., 1931, Emory University; Ph.D., 1934, University of Chicago. Librarian, 1934-37, Baylor University; Associate, 1937- , Assistant Director, 1942- , University of Illinois Library School.

DISTRICT VIII

WILLIAM CHARLES KORFMACHER, Classical Languages, Saint Louis University

Elected 1935; Chap. Secy., 1935-38; Chap. Pres., 1938-40; Secy., Missouri Conference of University Professors, 1939-41.

Born 1900. A.B., 1922, A.M., 1923, Saint Louis University; Ph.D., 1934, University of Chicago. Lecturer, 1923-25, Instructor, 1925-34, Assistant Professor,

¹ On leave of absence in the Office of Price Administration in Georgia.

1934-39; Associate Professor, 1939- , Secretary of Department, 1929- , Saint Louis University.

A. S. MERRILL, Mathematics, Montana State University

Elected 1924; Chap. Pres., 1934-35, 1939-40; Com. on Organization and Conduct of Chapters, 1941- .

Born 1887. A.B., 1911, M.A., 1914, Colgate University; Ph.D., 1916, University of Chicago. Assistant and Instructor, 1911-14, Colgate University; Assistant Professor, 1916-20, Associate Professor, 1920-23, Professor, 1923- , Chairman of Division of Physical Sciences, 1936- , Director of Institutional Research, 1941- , Montana State University.

To fill unexpired term (1942-44) of Professor Arthur L. Keith, of University of South Dakota, deceased:

WILLIAM L. BRADSHAW, Political Science, University of Missouri

Elected 1932; Chap. Vice-Pres., 1940.

Born 1896. State Teachers College, Warrensburg, Missouri, 1913-15; B.S., 1917, M.A., 1924, University of Missouri; Ph.D., 1930, State University of Iowa. Assistant Professor, 1925-27, University of Puerto Rico; Instructor, 1927-30, Assistant Professor, 1930-33, Associate Professor, 1933-41, Professor, 1941- , University of Missouri; on leave, 1933-34, as Field Agent, American Municipal Association.

STUART A. QUEEN, Sociology, Washington University

Elected 1934; Chap. Pres., 1938-39; member, American Civil Liberties Union, 1925- .

Born 1890. A.B., 1910, Pomona College; A.M., 1913, Ph.D., 1919, University of Chicago. Executive Secretary, 1913-17, California State Board of Charities and Corrections; Instructor, 1919, University of Illinois; Associate Professor, 1919-20, Goucher College; Professor, 1920-22, Simmons College; Professor, 1922-30, University of Kansas; Associate Secretary, 1930-32, Detroit Community Fund and Council of Social Agencies; Professor, 1932- , Washington University.

DISTRICT IX

FRANK E. E. GERMANN, Chemistry, University of Colorado

Elected 1920; Chap. Pres., 1929-30; Com. on Organization and Conduct of Chapters, 1936- .

Born 1887. A.B., 1911, Indiana University; Dr. ès Sc., 1914, University of Geneva. Teacher, 1907-09, elementary schools; Instructor, 1912-13, University of Geneva; Instructor, 1913-14, Indiana University; Instructor, 1914-18, Cornell University; Professor, 1918-19, Colorado School of Mines; Professor, 1919- , University of Colorado.

OTTIS H. RECHARD, Mathematics, University of Wyoming

Elected 1923; Chap. Secy., 1925-29; Chap. Pres., 1936-37; Chap. Exec. Com., 1940-41.

Born 1896. A.B., 1916, M.A., 1918, Gettysburg College; Ph.D., 1930, University of Wisconsin. Instructor, 1916-18, Gettysburg College; Instructor, 1919-23, Lecturer, 1929-30, University of Wisconsin; Assistant Professor, 1923-25, Associate Professor, 1925-28, Professor, 1928- , Chairman of Department, 1926- , University of Wyoming.

DISTRICT X**CHARLES FAIRMAN, Political Science, Stanford University¹**

Elected 1932; Chap. Secy., 1932-33; Chap. Pres., 1935-36.

Born 1897; A.B., 1918, M.A., 1920, University of Illinois; Ph.D., 1926, S.J.D., 1938, Harvard University; LL.B., 1934, University of London. Assistant Professor, 1926-28, Pomona College; Lecturer, 1928-30, Harvard University; Assistant Professor, 1930-36, Williams College; Brandeis Research Fellow, 1936-38, Harvard Law School; Associate Professor, 1938-41, Professor, 1941- , Stanford University.

MAX MASON, Mathematical Physics, California Institute of Technology

Elected 1915; Council, 1921-23.

Born 1877; B.Litt., 1898, University of Wisconsin; Ph.D., 1903, University of Göttingen. Instructor, 1903-04, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Assistant Professor, 1904-08, Yale University; Professor, 1908-25, University of Wisconsin; President, 1925-28, University of Chicago; Director for Natural Sciences, 1928-29, President, 1929-36, Rockefeller Foundation; Professor and Chairman of Observatory Council, 1936- , California Institute of Technology.

¹ On leave of absence in the Judge Advocate General's Department.

ORGANIZATION AND POLICY

REPORT OF COMMITTEE O FOR 1942

Committee O on Organization and Policy is charged primarily with the consideration of suggested changes in the Constitution and the By-Laws of the Association. In the past the Committee has met once a year to consider such suggestions. This year, in order to conserve the funds of the Association, the Committee carried on its work by correspondence. It seemed particularly desirable this year to conserve the Association's funds because of the effect which wartime conditions may have on the Association's revenue during the next few years.

The Committee proposes for consideration by the membership three amendments to the Constitution and one to the By-Laws. The proposed amendments to the Constitution are published at this time pursuant to Article IX, Section 2 of the Constitution, which provides for their communication to the membership "at least one month before the Annual Meeting."

I

The need for the first amendment to the Constitution was cited by the Council at its 1942 spring meeting. That body voted to request the Committee to formulate an amendment relating to the manner of filling a vacancy in the Council arising from death or resignation. Pursuant to Article III, Section 3 of the Constitution, the Council has the power to fill such vacancies, but its appointees hold office only until the next Annual Meeting, at which time an election is held. Experience has shown that it is difficult for the Council to get an acceptance of an appointment for such a short term. The members of the Council were unanimously of the opinion that the Council should have the power to fill a vacancy for the remainder of an unexpired term.

The consideration of this recommendation of the Council involved a related question of Association policy as expressed in

Article III, Section 3 of the Constitution as follows: "the retiring elective members of the Council shall not be eligible for immediate re-election" to office. If the Council should fill a vacancy for the remainder of an unexpired term, the member so appointed might hold office for almost a full term. This would be the case if the vacancy occurred prior to the spring meeting of the Council during a member's first year of office. On the other hand if the vacancy should occur just prior to the spring meeting of the Council during a member's third year of office, the appointee to succeed him would serve only for a few months. In the former case the policy which finds expression in the provision making elective members of the Council ineligible for immediate re-election seems to the Committee to be properly applicable, but should an appointee have served only a relatively short time as in the latter case it seems to the Committee that such an appointee should be eligible for immediate election to a full term. In the proposed amendment a Council member appointed to fill an unexpired term is at the expiration of this term eligible for immediate election to a full term provided his appointment was for a term of "not more than two years." The Committee believes that this limitation carries out the spirit of the present provision in the Constitution, which makes retiring elective members of the Council ineligible for immediate re-election to that office. (See Appendix I.)

II

The second amendment relates to Article X concerning the Annual Meeting. The first sentence of this article now reads: "The Association shall meet annually at such time and place as the Council may select." There is no provision empowering the officers or the Council to carry on essential business of the Association should circumstances such as the present war make the holding of an Annual Meeting impossible or unwise as regards the nation's war efforts. President Laprade and Secretary Himstead have suggested to the Committee the desirability of constitutional provisions to enable the Council to deal with such emergency situations.

After discussion by correspondence the Committee has agreed upon a form which empowers the Council to act if conditions "created by war or other national emergency should make the holding of a meeting impossible" or if, "in the opinion of the Council," the holding of a meeting would "impede the government in its efforts to cope with conditions created by war or other national emergency." The Committee believes that this wording gives adequate power to the Council without incurring any risk of its misuse. The text of this portion of the proposed amendment to Article X appears in Paragraph (1) of Appendix II.

The second paragraph of Appendix II contains the text of the present Article X, with the omission of the first sentence which is dealt with above. The only change at this point is that this part of Article X is now set apart as Section 2. (See Paragraph (2), Appendix II.)

There remains one other important part of the proposed amendment to Article X. If an Annual Meeting should be omitted, provision must be made for conducting the Annual Meeting business, which includes the election of officers and Council members. If this were not done, the only alternative would be to suspend the business now transacted by the Annual Meeting and to extend the terms of the officers and the members of the Council until a meeting could be held. The Committee is of the opinion that this alternative would be unwise. Accordingly, the Committee proposes as Section 3 of Article X an amendment which directs the Council in the event an Annual Meeting is omitted to transact the Annual Meeting business and to conduct the annual election by mail. For the text of this part of the proposed amendment to Article X, see Paragraph (3) of Appendix II.

The membership doubtless will recall that on several occasions the Committee has in its annual reports indicated its disapproval of election by a mail ballot. The Committee is still of the opinion that a mail ballot presents difficulties and disadvantages which make election by delegates and members present at the Annual Meeting preferable, but in a situation in which the choice lies between no election and an election by mail ballot the Committee believes the mail ballot a useful and necessary method of preserving the Association's democratic procedures. It should be added

that it has seemed desirable, indeed necessary, to draft the provision for a mail ballot in general terms, authorizing the officers and the Council to work out the details of the necessary machinery, with the one exception that the "election shall be by a proportional vote as described in Section 3 of Article III" of the Constitution.

III

A minor change in Article IX of the Constitution seems desirable in order to clarify the meaning of the clause in question. This Article, which deals with amendments to the Constitution, confines voting on amendments to Active Members, whereas if the text is interpreted literally any "five members" may propose an amendment. Presumably the word "Active" was omitted by inadvertence. The Committee, therefore, recommends that the word "Active" be inserted at the appropriate place, so that amendments may be proposed only by "Active Members." (See Appendix III.)

IV

By-Law 5 of the Association is concerned with the work of the General Secretary. The General Secretary has suggested a change in the wording of the last sentence of this By-Law. This sentence now reads:

He [the General Secretary] may with the approval of the President delegate any of these duties to an Associate Secretary or Assistant Secretary appointed by the Council for that purpose.

The General Secretary points out that the time may come when it will be necessary and/or desirable for the Association to have more than one Associate Secretary or Assistant Secretary. He, therefore, recommends that after the words "Associate Secretary" there be inserted the words "or Secretaries" and that a similar insertion be made after the words "Assistant Secretary." For the text of the proposed amendment, see Appendix IV.

In concluding this report the Committee wishes to say again that suggestions concerning changes in the Association's organic

law are always welcome. In the study of suggested constitutional changes it is part of the Committee's procedure to seek the views of the officers of the Association, of the Council and, in some instances, of the chapters and chapter officers. In this connection, however, it should be added that Committee O on Organization and Policy is not a Committee of the Council but of the Association as a whole, and it reports directly to the membership at the Annual Meeting. Expressions of opinion by the officers and members of the Council and by chapters and chapter officers are, therefore, advisory in nature and not binding on the Committee. They are, however, of great value to the Committee in the clarification of issues which may be involved in any proposed constitutional change.

W. W. COOK (Law), Northwestern University, *Chairman*
WILLIAM M. HEPBURN (Law), University of Alabama
ROBERT P. LUDLUM (History), Hofstra College
KIRK H. PORTER (Political Science), State University of Iowa
FRANCIS J. TSCHAN (History), Pennsylvania State College

Proposed Amendments

Appendix I

(1) The last two sentences of Article III, Section 3 of the Constitution now read:

In case of a vacancy in the office of President, the First Vice-President shall succeed to the office. In case of a vacancy in any other office, the Council shall have power to fill it *until the next Annual Meeting and such an appointee shall be eligible for continuance by election at that time.* (Italics supplied.)

Amend Article III, Section 3, as follows: Strike out of the last sentence of Section 3 the words italicized above, and substitute the following words:

for the remainder of the unexpired term, and, in the case of a Council member, the person so appointed, if the remainder of the term for which he is appointed is not more than two years, shall be eligible for subsequent immediate election for a full term.

As amended the last sentence of the Section will read:

In case of a vacancy in any other office, the Council shall have power to fill it for the remainder of the unexpired term, and, in the case of a Council member, the person so appointed, if the remainder of the term for which he is appointed is not more than two years, shall be eligible for subsequent immediate election for a full term.

Appendix II

(1) The first sentence of Article X now reads:

The Association shall meet annually at such time and place as the Council may select.

Amend this sentence by making it a separate paragraph or section numbered 1; by inserting a comma after the word "annually;" by changing the period at the end of the sentence to a comma; and by adding the following words:

unless conditions created by war or other national emergency should make the holding of a meeting impossible, or unless the holding of a meeting would, in the opinion of the Council, impede the government in its efforts to cope with conditions created by war or other national emergency.

As amended, the Section will read:

1. The Association shall meet annually, at such time and place as the Council may select, unless conditions created by war or other national emergency should make the holding of a meeting impossible, or unless the holding of a meeting would, in the opinion of the Council, impede the government in its efforts to cope with conditions created by war or other national emergency.

(2) Include all of the remaining sentences of Article X as Section 2 of this Article.

As amended Section 2 of Article X will read:

2. The Active and Junior Members of the Association in each Chapter may elect one or more delegates to the Annual Meeting. At the Annual Meeting all members of the Association shall be

entitled to the privileges of the floor, but only Active Members to a vote. Questions shall ordinarily be determined by majority vote of the Active Members present and voting, but on request of one-fifth of these members a proportional vote shall be taken. When a proportional vote is taken, the accredited delegates from each Chapter shall be entitled to a number of votes equal to the number of Active Members in their respective Chapters, but any other Active Member not included in a Chapter thus represented shall be entitled to an individual vote. In case a Chapter has more than one delegate, the number of votes to which it is entitled shall be equally divided among the accredited delegates present and voting. The manner of voting at a special meeting of the Association shall be the same as for the Annual Meeting.

Add as Section 3 of Article X the following:

3. If an Annual Meeting is omitted in accordance with the provision in Section 1, the Council shall transact the general Annual Meeting business and shall conduct the annual election by mail. Such an election shall be by a proportional vote as described in Section 3 of Article III.

Appendix III

The last clause of Article IX, Section 1 of the Constitution provides that amendments to the Constitution may be proposed "by five members of the Association."

Amend Article IX, Section 1, by inserting the word, "Active," between the words, "five members," and capitalize the word, "Members."

As amended the Section will read:

1. The Constitution may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the Active Members present and voting at any Annual Meeting, provided that on the request of one-fifth of these members a proportional vote shall be taken in a manner provided in Article X; and provided further that written notice of any proposed amendment shall be sent to the General Secretary by five Active Members of the Association not later than two months before the Annual Meeting.

Appendix IV

By-Law 5 is a statement concerning the duties of the General Secretary. The last sentence of By-Law 5 now reads:

He may with the approval of the President delegate any of these duties to an Associate Secretary or Assistant Secretary appointed by the Council for that purpose.

Amend the last sentence of By-Law 5 by inserting after the words, "Associate Secretary," the words, "or Secretaries," and after the words, "Assistant Secretary," the words, "or Secretaries."

As amended the sentence will read:

He may with the approval of the President delegate any of these duties to an Associate Secretary or Secretaries or Assistant Secretary or Secretaries appointed by the Council for that purpose.

Contributors

MERIBETH E. CAMERON is Dean and Professor of History at Milwaukee-Downer College.

CARROLL D. CHAMPLIN is Professor of Education at the Pennsylvania State College.

WILLIAM H. EDWARDS is Head of the Social Science Department of the State Teachers College in Brockport, New York. From 1934 until 1941 he was Associate Professor of History and Government at New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts; he was president of the chapter from 1936-1939.

W. FREEMAN GALPIN is Professor of English History at Syracuse University. He was secretary of the chapter from 1929-1932.

ROBERT B. HEILMAN is Associate Professor of English at Louisiana State University. He was secretary of the chapter from 1938-1940.

RALPH E. HIMSTEAD is General Secretary of the American Association of University Professors.

W. T. LAPRADE is Professor of History and Chairman of the Department at Duke University. He is President of the American Association of University Professors for the term of 1942 and 1943.

HAROLD A. LARRABEE is Professor of Philosophy at Union College. He was president of the chapter in 1937-1938.

ROBERT P. LUDLUM was Assistant Professor of History and Political Science at Hofstra College from 1940-1942, and is now Associate Secretary of the American Association of University Professors.

JOHN J. LUND is University Librarian of Duke University.

HOWARD DYKEMA ROELOFS is Professor of Ethics at the University of Cincinnati.

COMMUNICATIONS

June 17, 1942

Dear Editor:

Let me congratulate you on the April issue of the Association's *Bulletin*, which I read from cover to cover. The material is timely, it is practical, it is clear and thoroughly readable without being superficial.

I would, however, like to take issue with one point in Professor Carmichael's piece.¹ With his article as a whole I have no quarrel at all, but the following statement will bear some examination: "... a university ought to restrict its work to matters having intellectual content." I am bothered by the word "work." I believe academic courses should most certainly be judged by their intellectual content. But I think that the Antioch program, which combines work and study in alternate three-month periods for practically all its students, clearly demonstrates that it is easy enough to go beyond academic objectives and to achieve realistic preparation for life—more than that, to be a part of the most significant experiences which affect a nation.

But I would go even further. The student who learns journalism by working on a newspaper, engineering by sweating on the assembly line, personnel administration by being shoved around in Washington, cooperative management by actually participating in the worries of a cooperative does more than better his economic opportunities. Experience fertilizes concepts if properly exploited; example: four of our boys engaged in the big Ford-CIO strike, three on one side of the struggle and one on the other. Those boys know something about labor problems; they sometimes correct their teacher, who has to keep on his toes. This situation holds true in very many directions.

The total effect of this sort of training is that it engenders maturity of judgment. A part of this mature temper is undoubtedly

¹ Review by Peter A. Carmichael of "An Adventure in Education," by the Swarthmore College Faculty, April, 1942 *Bulletin*, pp. 278-287.

due to the fact that our people go to school for a longer period of time, but a part of it comes from the concrete nature of their experience.

Hazing, cheerleaders, pep meetings, fraternities, rushing, snobbery, have simply been ridiculed out of existence. The strict hierarchical line between teachers and students has almost completely disappeared. The actual administration of the school is increasingly a joint enterprise, and democracy is becoming a very palpable reality at Antioch.

This is no longer theory. We have had over twenty years of experience with it. I would not attribute everything, such as increasing maturity and democratic pattern, to the work and study plan. A great deal of the temper of Antioch can be traced to its teaching personnel and to a courageous type of leadership. Undoubtedly, the unfreezing of old patterns and the habit of careful experimentation can largely be connected with the participation of our students in the life of some twenty states in the union.

Sincerely yours,
HERMAN SCHNURER
Professor of French
Antioch College

July 6, 1942

Dear Sir:

May I take up the cudgel in defense of President Wilkins vs. DR Scott? (*Bulletin*, February, 1941, pp. 18-28; April, 1942, pp. 247-256.)

I, too, looked suspiciously at Dr. Wilkins' passage concerning ambition in a President; surely here, thought I, autocracy shows its head! But no; he says only that he believes he has capacities for public service that remain unused in the professorial chair.

To my way of thinking, this is the one good reason why a professor should accept an administrative position. I do not admire the faintly cynical tone of DR Scott's phrase, "... a messianic complex." Here a large question is opened. All human institutions change with time; periods of evolution alternate with periods of revolution. Conceivably, any adjustment of the institution to its

environment, however great, can be made by slow evolution if there is enough time; but occasionally the only alternatives are quick revolution or death. The lone inventor, who has made so many contributions in so many fields, may have important revolutionary ideas in the field of college education. How can he hope to have them tried unless he is possessed of what DR Scott disparagingly calls "an inner urge which demands appeasement?"

I hasten to admit that I look with astonishment on those professors who turn administrant and with envy on those who have good ideas about teaching. I can't always recognize a good new idea when I see one; I have to see it tried first. If it involves only minor readjustments, I like to see it tried; otherwise not. No good big idea gets by me without a struggle; if it's big enough, it requires an executive order! If my reactions are typical—and I think they are—it's an advantage to have a new idea advocated by a man who dramatizes himself as a crusader.

With most of DR Scott's article, I am in agreement; and so, no doubt, is Dr. Wilkins. It does take a big man to be a good executive; we do need a liberalizing of faculty relations with the administration; both sides should make a vigorous and long-continued effort to understand one another's problems and to come to a working agreement concerning their common goal.

But why shouldn't a president be a Man with a Mission? What else can sustain him amid his endless trials?

Yours very truly,

CHARLES WILLIAMSON

Assistant Professor of Physics

Carnegie Institute of Technology

Those Itinerant Instructors

August 7, 1942

Dear Editor:

The article¹ on the itinerant instructor in the June number of this journal had so barbed a point and the point was so well driven home that it ought to be taken with a grain of salt—and the salt rubbed

¹ "The Itinerant Instructor" by Bernard N. Schilling, June, 1942 *Bulletin*, pp. 369-379.

into the wound. Professor Schilling is concerned with the plight of the young instructor wherever found, and that plight is not a very happy one. Tenure, for all its virtues, may triumph over merit. But he uses the English instructor for his crying example, and weakens his general case, it seems to me, by doing so. For the conditions which make that example cry so loudly are largely peculiar to the English department. In all departments, to be sure, the popular saw is reversed and there is a good deal more room at the bottom than at the top. But the disparity in the English department is egregious, and the salt I would rub into the wound is by way of a reminder that it is not only egregious but altogether gratuitous—the result of an utterly false assumption. I know that this is virtually indicting a whole nation, but I venture none the less.

The villain of the piece is the presence in the English department of the universally required freshman composition. The point is not the value of the course, though its value may be questioned. It lies in certain consequences that follow from that sweeping prescription, the only sweeping prescription still imposed. Thus, in a typical university of, say, five or six thousand students there will be some eighteen hundred freshmen each year, and even with crowded sections of forty each there will be about forty-five sections of this one course. That means the equivalent of full-time teaching for from twelve to fifteen instructors. The work is usually spread out a little thinner over the English faculty, but these figures will suggest the scope of the problem there—precarious and temporary perches on the bottom rung of the ladder for a dozen aspirants, and all the rungs above them already comfortably filled by occupants of whom few die and none resign. And to add the sardonic touch, one of the chief occupations of these occupants is to turn out increasing numbers of rivals for perches on the bottom rung.

The assumption on which this predicament rests is that the courses of instruction that create it belong to the English department. Officially they are *there*, to be sure, but they do not belong either by logic or by common sense. To be sure, they are called courses in *English* composition—and perhaps it is on that verbal thread that they hang—hang themselves and hang the department.

For, as I should like to point out, the association is very uncomfortable, if not fatal, to both. But that is a sheer accident of words. Any examination of the purpose and subject of these courses will reveal that they bear no more affinity to the work of the English department than to that of any other department in the university.

In the first place, the course is maintained not by the demand of the English department but by the common demand of all the departments in the university. In all the years, and through all the changes of the American college since Dr. Eliot's elective system was established, this course has been the one exception, the one course that has been everywhere required. It belongs to the common need, and responds to the common need. And it responds to that need because English is the common instrument of thought and communication in all courses of study. The special discipline of the course is not founded on English literature and the English language as departmental fields of study and scholarship, but on the simple fact that English happens to be the mother tongue of our students, and is the common medium of instruction and response in all branches of their education.

In point of fact this course in English composition has *less* relation to the subject and purpose of a department of literature and language than to almost any other department in the university. For such a department to provide courses where the specially fit and ambitious may practice the forms of literature is a fine thing, and is altogether proper. But here we are concerned with a course which all the colleges of the university require of all students, and require because, no matter what their subjects, intelligible writing is imperative and cogent writing is desirable. And these virtues have no more relation to literature than to any other subject. To be sure, they are not impertinent there. But the literary use of language *par excellence*, the figurative use of it, the stylistic audacity, the imaginative spontaneity—these are just what, in the use of language, cannot be taught. What can be taught are precision, concision, clarity, coherence, and order—the intellectual qualities of discourse. This would put the special discipline of freshman composition into closer alliance with any of half a dozen other departments of the university than with that of

literature. It does not, in fact, belong to any one department; it has a function common to them all.

The special alliance with the department of English, however, is not only illogical; it is an evil all around. I return in a moment to Professor Schilling's point, but first I should like to celebrate the admirable confusion of the present arrangement. The courses are now conducted on the fag system: there are menial services to be performed in the department (freshman composition); everyone has had to serve in his time; let the young novice take it on, either during his novitiate or immediately after. To be sure, the work has nothing to do with the subject he is studying, and, except as a job with a stipend, is not a stepping-stone in his career. It is simply something to endure and to escape from as soon as possible. The result is a set of teachers who are, to say the least, not greatly interested in the work they have to do. How could interest be expected of them? They are doing time. Even if they should develop an interest, they no sooner acquire it than they are dismissed and a new set of novices put in their place. There is nothing in the fag system to redeem the course from the low repute it has in the university; there is often, as a consequence of that system, little to keep it from deserving that repute.

I return to Professor Schilling's difficulty. It can readily be seen how the separation of this course would affect the English department. It would deprive the graduate end of it of an important bait. With a dozen or so teaching fellowships to offer it can draw a goodly supply of graduate students into its fold. And with a vast array of periodically vacated jobs throughout the country to choose from it can place its Masters and Doctors promptly. But it is just the plight of this excess of raw faculty material, after the graduate school has washed and wiped its hands of them, that makes up Professor Schilling's case. Difficulties of the sort are not, of course, limited to the English department. Everywhere, and not only in universities, there are more workmen than foremen, more curates than bishops, more lieutenants than generals. But the case he made is especially onerous in the English department, and especially onerous just because of the impertinence there of the courses in freshman composition.

Would, then, the mere separation of these courses bring about

a cure? It would affect the graduate work of the English department, and no doubt this would be a little hard to bear. But, after all, it would only put the English department on a par with other departments. And ultimately it would bring the number of itinerants in that department down to a normal level—a high level, perhaps, but no longer egregious.

The need for teachers in freshman composition would, of course, remain undiminished. Would the mere separation of them from the English department change the picture on their side? It is one of the comedies of the American college that it should pick out a subject and say of it: this alone is imperative; take what else you please; this you must have—and then having provided for it administratively to have abandoned it to the most casual sort of teaching, as if to say, the students have to take it anyhow, so why bother? The college doesn't bother. It turns the teaching over to young men and women ambitious to become teachers of literature and linguistics. Now the discipline for a degree in literature or linguistics does virtually nothing to prepare the teacher for the special work of the course in freshman composition. And the special discipline of the course does virtually nothing for the prospective teacher of literature or linguistics.

These are the reasons, then, why, as it seems to me, the course in freshman composition ought to be in a separate department with a permanent staff of its own. It would thus engender no brood of fledglings for any other department to dispose of. For itself it would not be liable to a quadrennial turnover. Under such favorable conditions it might attain to something of the value which the university publicly claims for it and privately flouts. That claim has some actual grounds. The fact that the subject of the course is the only one the university can point to as of unquestionable value for every one only echoes the other fact that it is the oldest of all subjects in the long tradition of university education.

Sincerely yours,
 SHERLOCK B. GASS
 Professor of English
 University of Nebraska

REVIEWS

A Short History of Canada for Americans, by Alfred LeRoy Burt.
Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1942. Pp. 300.
\$3.00.

Professor Burt writes with a definite purpose. He seeks to tell Americans, and by that he chiefly means the citizens of the United States, the narrative of Canadian history. Many events and personalities well known to our neighbor to the north are omitted with the attending result that the reader does not have to wade through pages of material that do not concern or interest him. A judicious selection of facts is not an easy task and it may be that some critics will bemoan the absence of certain events. Omissions most assuredly appear, but when an American has laid down this volume he should realize that essential facts and interpretations are not wanting. Moreover, and this is highly important, the American should have acquired a basis for a more appreciative understanding of what Canada has been, what it is today, and what it is likely to be tomorrow.

Yes, this attractive volume is of interest and value to Americans. The reviewer, however, is of the opinion that it should be of equal value and interest to Canadians, not merely because it clearly presents the trend of life in Canada but also because it depicts American attitudes toward Canada. To illustrate, Americans will most certainly profit from Professor Burt's treatment of the Loyalists, but by the same token so will the Canadians. The carefully interwoven pattern of events, affecting both, should also produce another result, which clearly was in the mind of the author, namely, that of creating a greater sense of solidarity and good will between the nationals of both democracies. It is significant to note that no line of forts has ever extended, from the Pacific to the Atlantic, along the boundaries of the two nations, but is it not also significant that such a barrier should never be erected?

Canadians, throughout their long and eventful history, so we are told, have frequently been drawn toward the American Republic

and to prove this drift the author has marshalled an imposing array of events. The infiltration of French Canadians into New England, the trek of American farmers into Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba, the impact of American political thought and institutions upon Canadian governmental behaviors, the separatist movement in British Columbia—these and other events amply illustrate the margin which stalled unity or annexation. That the latter did not transpire was due to an intelligent British opinion, to the skill and foresight of men like Macdonald, Mackenzie, and Laurier, and to the growing sense of Canadian nationalism. And in dealing with the latter, the reader becomes aware of the keen rivalry, if not open hostility, that existed between those of British and French descent. One of the most fascinating aspects of this volume is the story of how these different cultures struggled for self-expression—at times for domination. Out of this struggle, however, a united people and nation appeared. Loyalty to Canada is uppermost in the hearts of all its citizens, be they French or British.

On the other side of the ledger one is apt to speculate over the author's speculation. The American Revolution, we are told, might have been "nipped in the bud" if London actually had intended the Quebec Act to be the pernicious thing Americans thought it was. Again, we are asked to weigh what the result would have been if the powerful armament sent from England in the spring of 1776 to quell the American invasion of Canada had gone to "Boston harbor instead of up the St. Lawrence;" the inference being that there might have been no revolution. In both of these cases, as in others, the reader is led to believe that historical development rested, in the last analysis, upon one single event. May the American Revolution, in brief, be explained solely in terms of the Quebec Act? Are we to conclude that if this act had not come into being there might have been no revolt? Of course, one cannot ask John Adams, Patrick Henry, John Hancock, and the others what their attitudes would have been if there had been no Quebec Act, but in the light of their actions and spoken words it seems probable that the trend toward war would have marched on. To have prevented revolution London would have had to evolve an entirely new colonial policy and attitude toward the

colonies, and this the British could not do because the eighteenth century mind could no more think in terms of a Statute of Westminster than it could of the telephone or radio. The Quebec Act might be classed as the precipitating event precisely as it took the firing on Fort Sumter to set off the American Civil War, but to claim that subsequent developments have to be interpreted as dependent upon *that* event is pushing the argument too far. Speculation as to what might have taken place if this had happened or that had not taken place is highly interesting, but it most certainly is not history.

This speculative quality, however, does not detract from the merit of this volume. Actually, it stimulates one's interest which generally is kept at a high level by a style that lightens the narrative throughout. Examine, if you will, the chapter "Life in New France;" here is a brilliantly conceived and executed picture of Canadians at home. Like the famous third chapter in Macaulay's *History of England* (and "Life in New France" is Chapter 3) one is amply repaid for having read the others. But the others are also of interest, even the dull and brittle facts of Canadian government (Chapter 12) become restful and pleasing. And to add to the value of this book there are a number of selected illustrations and maps. The index is satisfactory. The editors of the University of Minnesota Press should be thanked for having sponsored this volume.

Syracuse University

W. FREEMAN GALPIN

The Academic Man: A Study in the Sociology of a Profession, by Logan Wilson. New York: The Oxford University Press, 1942. Pp. vi, 248. \$3.00.

College and university professors will be interested in Professor Wilson's book. He is not concerned to establish a philosophy of education. His purpose is rather, as he expresses it, to fill the lack of a "single work giving a broad but unified view of the academic profession in its institutional setting" by presenting "an ordered view of the complex rôles and processes in which the academician

participates." Or, in other words, he seeks to provide "a description and analysis of behavior patterns found in almost all leading American universities today." (Pages 4, 5.)

This in itself is a large task, and Professor Wilson plunges zestfully into it. There is a discussion of how an individual becomes an academic man—the factors which lead the individual to choose an academic career and the ways in which the academic world chooses the individual, or how it accepts him or competes for him. There is a consideration of the graduate schools, telling how they operate, the types of requirements usually adhered to, the proportion of graduate students who eventually earn advanced degrees and the length of time it takes them to do it. Naturally there is material on how and where graduate schools exert their influence. There is realistic comment on the methods by which newly hatched Ph.D.'s may secure employment. This part of the book, of course, is by way of launching the academic man upon his career. Professor Wilson then watches his progress from his appointment as an instructor ("the young employee typically mounts the first rung of the occupational ladder with zest and pleasant anticipations") through his attainment of an associate professorship ("the house-and-garden stage") to the time when finally he becomes a full professor ("his adjustment to the organization is so complete and his status so secure that there are few individual problems derived from mere occupation of this status . . . the competitive pressure shifts from rising and is transmuted into the urgency of living up to the expectations of one's position"). The professor may, indeed, become a "Professor Administrant," and under this heading there are some general remarks about the ideal and the actual organization of colleges and universities, together with a description of the duties and activities of presidents, deans, and heads of departments. All this comprises Part I of the book.

Part II, "Academic Status," carefully and succinctly answers in terms of actual practice such familiar but important questions as: How much time do academic men devote to various kinds of activities and what effect has this upon their careers? What methods seem to be used in evaluating the services of academicians, and, particularly, what is the relative importance assigned

to teaching and to publication in selecting men for appointment or promotion? What is the socio-economic status of college and university professors? What are the determinants of this status? What are its rewards and frustrations?

Part III is called "Academic Processes and Functions." As is the case with other parts of the book, the substance of this portion is familiar to readers who are themselves academicians. Professor Wilson's remarks, however, may be expected to clarify thoughts which most professors have entertained but may not have pondered. Because, as Professor Wilson remarks (page 157), "the academician participates in a highly competitive social system," there is a discussion of the factors which determine the relative standing of colleges and universities and the various attempts to rank institutions in the order of their standing. This makes use, among other things, of the rankings compiled for the Association of American Universities and by the American Council on Education.

Returning once more to the individual academician, Professor Wilson has chapters on "Prestige and the Teaching Function" and "Prestige and the Research Function." These consider in more detail the rewards attached to these two functions and the methods customarily employed to determine how effectively an individual is performing them. The book itself ends with a set of conclusions. There are appendices and an index.

Professor Wilson writes throughout in the terminology of the sociologist. A gleam comes into the reader's eye when he sees the sentence, "It cannot be denied, however, that perversions of the process of competition and overemphasis of prestige values tend to make successful teaching and research commodities that are manufactured for the direct purpose of trading them for personal prestige." (Page 173.) But the reader's eye is more likely to droop when it encounters, "Because of the individual researcher's necessity for maintaining his status or heightening his visibility in order to enhance chances for horizontal or vertical mobility, intellectual inquiry, unlike the growing of mushrooms, is not carried on in hidden recesses away from the public gaze." (Page 197.)

College and university teachers will not be likely to disagree with most of what Professor Wilson has to say. Much of his book

consists of exposition of the facts of the academic world and judicious comment upon them. He is particularly acute in making a point which he mentions in connection with several topics. This is his insistence upon the contrast frequently existing between "speech-reactions" and day-to-day practice, that is, the difference between lip-service to various ideals and the true devotion to them which comes from the heart. Although this distinction is of the utmost importance, men and women in the academic world too frequently lose sight of it.

One chapter will appeal especially to readers of this *Bulletin*. This is the one entitled "Professional Status." In it Professor Wilson discusses codes of ethics, organizations for protecting and advancing the status of professors, the bargaining power of professors, and academic freedom. He describes the American Association of University Professors and the American Federation of Teachers and their work. That Professor Wilson is aware of the need and the desirability of professional solidarity among college and university teachers and of the difficulties that stand in the way of achieving such solidarity is evident in the concluding paragraph of the chapter entitled "Professional Status." He writes (pages 132-133),

Granted that ideally there should be a consciousness of the dignity of the profession, an *esprit de corps* among its members, and an unrelenting devotion to the disinterested pursuit of knowledge, one does not have to assume a muck-raking attitude to show that the actual state of affairs differs considerably from what it would be under ideal conditions. Aside from the fact that the employee status of professors places definite limits upon the powers of their professional organization to clarify issues in its own way, there is the additional complication of widely divergent interests. The average academician's time and energy are divided among a number of scholarly and scientific societies, and these often have a priority of interest for him which lessens the amount of attention he can or does give to a strictly professional association, so that the A. A. U. P. labors under heavier odds than does the American Medical Association or the American Bar Association.

In a book of this kind it is disappointing to find instances of something less than careful scholarship. For instance, on page

117 it is stated that "The A. A. U. P. has a code [of ethics] containing rather explicit norms for each of the following categories: (1) relations of the teacher to his profession; (2) relations of the teacher to his students; (3) relations of the teacher to his colleagues; (4) relations of the teacher to his institution and its administrators; (5) relations of the teacher to the nonacademic world." The Association has not adopted a specific code of ethics and the author recognizes this fact in an "erratum" inserted in the appendix where the code is printed in full. The American Association of University Professors has endorsed statements of principles governing academic freedom and tenure and the ethics of appointments and resignations. Even these definite statements of principles are not regarded by the Association as hard and fast codes but rather as statements of generally recognized good academic practice. No attempt, however, has yet been made to prepare a comprehensive code with reference to the whole of good academic practice.

The code referred to by Professor Wilson was drawn up by the chapter of the Association at the University of Michigan. It is similar in form and content to other suggested codes prepared by chapters. Indeed, in the *Bulletin* of the Association, February, 1937 (Vol. XXIII, No. 2, p. 143), from which Professor Wilson reprints the code, it is explicitly stated that: "The document before you is a product of two years' work by the Committee on Ethics of the Michigan chapter. It was drafted with the view to submission for publication in the *Bulletin* of our Association; not as a finished code for which we would ask adoption, but as a means to elicit nation-wide criticism." To make doubly sure that there should be no misunderstanding of the nature of the code, on page 145 of the same issue of the *Bulletin* appears the statement: "It is desired, however, that you should not mistake the code before you for something more ambitious than it pretends to be. This is a suggested, not a perfected code."

Again, on page 186 of his book Professor Wilson says, "The A. A. U. P. Committee on Training of Graduate Students for College Teaching has expressed a very lukewarm attitude toward compulsory education courses, and feels that if courses in practice teaching and methods are offered, the subject matter departments

should give them." The committee to which Professor Wilson refers was not one of the American Association of University Professors, but was a committee of the Association of American Universities. Professor Wilson's comment is upon a condensed version of a report of this committee published in the February, 1933, *Bulletin* (Vol. XIX, No. 2, pp. 127 ff.) of the American Association of University Professors under the heading, "Educational Discussion. Association of American Universities. Report of the Committee on Training of Graduate Students for College Teaching."

Professor Wilson too often seems to have read the *Bulletin* so hastily as to take away inaccurate impressions. This appears not only in cases like the ones just cited, but also in his descriptions of the functions and activities of the Association (pages 119 ff., 128-130). It is unfortunate that Professor Wilson's book should be marred by lapses as serious as these.

Hofstra College

ROBERT P. LUDLUM

Education in a Democracy, edited by Newton Edwards. Charles R. Walgreen Foundation Lectures. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941. Pp.155. \$1.25.

For two years press, radio, and forum have been evaluating democracy—appropriately. Basic agreement is general—naturally; crises defer doubt. Debaters tend to concur, among other things, on the importance of education in a democracy. Discussion of what it is to do, however, or how to do it does not often get down to fundamentals. A dean of education, for instance, finds these ample as state-university functions: "Indoctrination against subversive ideologies";¹ making "all citizens . . . informed,

¹ Cf. Professor Buswell in *Education in a Democracy*: "It is difficult and probably impossible to draw any sharp line of demarcation between indoctrination and freedom. The issue here is simply one of emphasis. A dictatorship imposes its beliefs and systems upon the new generation, whereas a democracy attempts to enlighten its youth, trusting in the understanding which clear perspective affords to direct young people into ways of living that are progressively better . . ."

skilled, socialized"; provision of military training and of a multitude of extra-curricular activities for students.

But that is in the marches. Does the city do better? Unhappily, no. At least Chicago. Seven out of the eight of President Hutchins' professors of education and psychology who contribute to *Education in a Democracy* seem singularly unaware of the basic issues with which they ought to be dealing. Charles D. Walgreen has been short-changed.

Newton Edwards says we fail worst in not providing equal educational opportunity; a failure, doubtless, but there are worse—corrupting youth with handouts, for instance. He is for "social mobility," fancy words for social instability or for social and economic ladder-climbing (about which he is just a teeny-weeny bit uncomfortable). He gets in a mild lick at concentration of economic power and a plug for "enduring values"—the casual genuflection that all the essayists make en route to the free-lunch counter.

Robert Havighurst is all for social mobility too, *i. e.*, getting on in the world; but, since unhappily the top spots are limited, he thinks we should consider "educating fewer," lest the educated who don't go up threaten "social cohesion"; everybody who isn't to go up should be trained to be satisfied downstairs. He seems unaware that we might educate for a different sort of elevation.

Mandel Sherman is a relativist and an adjuster who thinks of intellect and reality as antithetical and who conceives of all education as a scheme to prevent frustrations. Like Mr. Havighurst, unaware that institutional mechanics can hardly counteract the false values of a civilization, he still almost recognizes the destructiveness of our ideal of material success. But he sees the "abstract" and the "conservative" as allies of successism, finds remedies only in better "motivation" and "social values" (who is to define them?).

Ralph Tyler proposes to establish a curriculum for democracy but gets lost en route and only repeats praise for the high school where pupils solve community problems like erosion, nutrition, and recreation—the activist formula. He is all for "American ideals," with the misty charm of the Beatitudes. Sad to relate, his "common values" turn out to be relative; the need for the

getting-together of ideas and knowledge degenerates into the getting-together of people, sentimentalized as "cooperative action" by teachers; "training in the techniques of group action" becomes training in compromise, with no indication that at times compromise is vicious. When he talks about a "better democratic society" one can only wonder what he means by it.

William C. Reavis wants to secure democratic ideals in teaching and administration by having less authoritarianism and more student participation. See Irving Babbitt: "the lust for immediacy."

John Dale Russell is delighted by a host of "new educational services" (but are they education?)—nursery schools, work experience, camp experience (really); "social" services such as transportation, free hot lunches, and recreational activities; junior colleges, teachers colleges, extension work. Ol'McDonald had a farm, ee-ay-ee-ay-oh. *Service* is a "conjur"-word nowadays; few look for the trick. Concealed here is the fact that busy-ness is not good of itself; that lack of central principle results in unfocused, scrambled activism; that all this busybody frenzy dilutes what ought to be concentrated; that it becomes a hotcha curb-service by girls with bare thighs. Problem: how much real nutriment is provided? Though he thus depressingly avoids the subject of education, Mr. Russell has one thought: the dubiousness of "intelligence tests" or "some other supposedly scientific method" of evaluating students. He prefers "drive"—his way, I take it, of saying that "rights" are not enough, that there must be a moral coefficient in students. It is a pity that institutions, instead of being complimented for a greedy grabbing of every kind of activity they can get their hands on, should not likewise be expected to practice some moral virtues—here, specifically, continence.

George A. Works rambles on about the "University's Responsibility" in such a way that you can't pin him down; like Mr. Tyler, he floats in a verbal realm of feathery insubstantiality. Of course, he is for knowing the past and advancing knowledge and all that. He toys with the open-door policy, the vogue in research, the mushrooming of occupational training, the relation of school and state. It looks as if he is for the status quo.

There it is, presumably Education's Best—a bit of sparring with

real problems in spots, but mostly a flat rehashing of street-corner philosophy. Ironically, these strongest proponents of concreteness achieve a miracle of hollow and intangible expression. When such diverse thinkers as Dewey, Foerster, and Flexner are quoted, their contrasting solidity and sharpness come with a refreshing jolt. The Educators bumble in a verbal jungle, tied up in the parasitic creepers of technical verbiage and the undergrowth of tautology, witness this woolly jargon: "... it becomes difficult to define the unemployment problem with sufficient clarity to make its nature obvious."

For relief we turn to Guy Buswell, who says he is going to talk about essentials and really does, who grasps the kinship of the "conservative" and the "dynamic"; the "disastrous chaos" resulting from the elective system; the fallacy of the anti-intellectuals in striving for a curriculum "determined more by the life of the local community than by the body of truth... of the human race" (Carleton Washburne, please note); the laziness of permitting student-control because of "an outmoded doctrine of interest plus a naive interpretation of the rights of children in a democracy"; the importance for "versatility" ("adjustment," apparently, though discernment, comprehension are implied) of "general understandings, general principles, general values" and the corresponding inadequacy of "specific concrete facts" and of education in a "specific, practical way." He rises to paradox: "It is in this sense that theoretical or general education is the most practical of all—practical in that it has the broadest scope of applications and that it gives to its possessor the greatest degree of freedom and versatility." Further:

This basic truth, that the essence of education lies in the generalized nature of its content, is often overlooked. . . . The activity movement, incidental learning, pupil-selected learning units—all have values in the beginning stages of learning; but the extent to which these methods are being spread is producing what may be described as glorified kindergartens, even in secondary schools and, occasionally, in college classes—glorified kindergartens to the extent that they never lead to that important kind of generalized understanding which alone can give versatility.

It is amazing in this book to find insistence that "quality of living" is more important than vocational and monetary progress, that democracy depends on "the things they [the people] live for and the values which they prize," that between materialism and pedantry we fail to teach the real values which alone can break down class cleavage, develop inner resources, buttress against defeat and tragedy, and become the center of unifying loyalties. The wider the range of experiences which people share through intellectual training, the greater the social solidarity (here is the answer to the gentlemen who merely devise scholastic plots to prevent "frustration" and produce "social cohesion").

To Mr. Buswell's merits we shall return in considering three questions which we might legitimately expect to elicit attention from educators discussing their function in a democracy.

1. Is education the tutor or the tool of society? The tool, say most Educators, who are appeasers. Mr. Russell warns of doom if we don't "adjust the service of the schools to the requirements of the social order" and appears to think that the only hindrance to this amiable condescension is "the foolish prejudices of . . . traditionally conservative school people." How like Vichy this sounds, or the street-corner intellectual who has read about Progress in the Sunday Papers. Mr. Buswell observes, however, that a chief obstacle to "an enrichment of the school's program" is the fact that "parents urge the kind of education which will enhance their children's prestige and will give them entrance to preferred occupations." Unhappily this is what "the requirements of the social order" turn out to be. To become a pander to society is not a preservative for the schools but is suicidal, for the job can be so much better done by agencies traditionally devoted to it. And to become a pander to any order is to aid in its disintegration; no order thrives on compliance and flattery or on the absence of that difficulty and opposition which compel it to find its own strongest ground and to stay there whatever the laboriousness or the pressures of axe-grinder groups.

Fortunately, education is not everywhere considered the tool of society. Americans in general want independent schools: positions are reasonably permanent, the qualifications of incumbents are rather objectively defined, and there is relatively strong hos-

tility to the political incursions which in many other spheres are viewed with tolerance or resignation. Such phenomena argue a widely held concept of education as the tutor of society, not as a machine for processing streamlined ditto-marks for Modern Times or producing what self-appointed *voces populi* order up for short-sighted clients. As long as people have not become irremediably corrupt, they will support an institutional tutor as well as a private one. The contemporary world will determine the objectives and in the main the processes of the tutor, but the contemporary world fortunately has memory and judgment and imagination as well as awareness of immediate wants, and the former *can* outweigh the latter. Man empowers the tutor to speak for his total self against his partial self, for all of the potentialities that his history implies against the fragmentary being that is recorded at any given moment in time. Education is man's agency against present men. As long as men can grasp that fact, man can survive—by overcoming the partial being that yearns always to dominate the whole (and destroy it) and that, to achieve mastery, devises slick stratagems and coats them with fascinating make-up: "Meet the Demands of Society," "Fit Into Your Own World," "We Teach Getting On," "Fifteen Easy Lessons." Man's victory over that part of himself resolves the paradox of education as the product of society and yet the restrainer and reformer of it (reformer, that is, by influence on radical direction, not by statistical or legislative prestidigitation or by tossing off a hugger-mugger of societal gadgets). President Hutchins, too, has said that we get what we want; but he evidently does not think that we want entirely the wrong things, for he urges, no doubt feeling that the proposal is not wholly visionary, "Let us find what is good for all and teach them that." In summary: the strength of education is measured by the strength of its opposition to the merely contemporary.

2. What precedes partially answers the next question: If education is the tutor of society, the tutor by what standards? Now we may say that tool and tutor are identical if by tool we mean not an agent of existent society, a confirmer of the status quo, but if we mean by it a supporter of the best potentialities of our society, a strengthener of those elements in it which make for permanence, and an enemy of the disintegrating forces, however

seductive or overpowering these forces (such as our materialism) may seem. Even Mr. Russell's phrase "requirements of the social order" could, adequately defined, be useful. The trouble with Educators, however, is their equating requirements with wants, desires, itches: a man may need a pair of pants but want a chocolate bar—his "requirement" of education; or, if he wants to study salesmanship or get rich quick, it is a "foolish prejudice" to try to teach him the history of Western Civilization. Assuredly Mr. Russell and his colleagues will deny that they are chocolate-bar vendors, and they will point to those faithful paragraphs in which they say, most of them, that the first function of education is to preserve the human heritage; but with them the human heritage is like the weasel—quickly kissed. Then his friends are off to devote their main energies to personality-tinkering, patent-medicine marketing, and a gallimaufry of getting on, hot lunches, current events, and other pastimes of the busybody school.

But if "requirements" are what the social order has to have to survive and to improve, let education be a tool of society. Then, too, it will "reflect" society in the best sense: reflect not the present imperfect actuality but the potentiality only partly realized in the formal body. The tutor's standards are then the necessities for permanence as against the desires and apparent needs of the moment, however compulsively these may impinge upon us.

To believe in democracy one must certainly believe that it represents what we call an "eternal verity" (a useful term, despite its popularity with the sentimentalists), that it brings into play human elements that function stably and permanently and conduce to the well-being of society; otherwise we are merely a stage in an evolutionary or historical process and can think of ourselves only chronologically. Unless democracy is only a temporary formula, a step in a sequence, it must be nourished on eternal verities: in other words, not on those doses of contemporary goings-on (obsolescent information in Mr. Hutchins' term), significant only in a transitory order. Education deriving from a metaphysics of flux is more of the hard-and-gemlike-flame business (though what we get is a kind of wavering gaslight always likely to go out and leave us in a fair way of asphyxiation). To know only the here-and-now, to adjust to it, to anticipate the "concrete realities of life"—all this, as a

mode of education, is surely to say that the present is all, and, ironically, to bring a way of life to an end, to guarantee its end, by ignoring what can give it continuing vitality and save it. We can have a future only by preparing for it, and we prepare for it not by ignoring it but by learning what is equally true of it and of the past. And only in the past can that lesson be learned. If democracy is to endure, it must gain sustenance from the enduring; but a relativistic world of Education denies the existence of the enduring.

It is conventional to justify the "preparation for actual life" as a preservative and especial concomitant of democracy, to consider the "practical" and the humanistic as antithetical, to identify belles lettres, philosophy, the arts with an earlier "aristocratic" social order in which, as an aspect of accepted inequalities, the few had a great deal of time to spend, agreeably but not usefully, on the entertainments of the mind. This dichotomy is demagogic—and, unhappily, destructive. It is precisely in the name of democracy (to ignore all other considerations) that we need to recover lost ground, to revivify the "aristocratic" tradition. To be "practical" by multiplying courses in salesmanship, advertising, what passes for civics, "business English," "business ethics," by substituting vocational training for a real intellectual and spiritual discipline and then mistaking it for education—this is ultimately to destroy democracy by eliminating from the regimen of young people those experiences that transcend the immediate present and induct them into a realm of values where alone continuity and community can be. Only such a realm will support democracy. Hence it is that there is rather more connection between knowledge of Dante and survival of democracy than between knowledge of banking and survival of democracy.

Mr. Buswell implies most of this when he says that the "concrete" is likely to give very little preparation for anything and that the "quality of living" is the test of education. But we need to investigate further the qualities of living that make for survival.

3. Besides what it ought to foster, what must education chiefly guard against and attempt to counteract? This is the previous question restated to stress the inverse of the problem.

On the one hand, we need a major concern with the enduring, with an illuminating past, with the best in the human tradition.

So alone can man diagnose the present and assure the future, for so alone can he acquire the dignity and responsibility necessary in a democracy.

On the other hand, education must guard against the spurious claims of the immediate. Now this issue has been stated, so to speak, in chronological terms, with stress on the ties of before and after: man destroys his future by ignoring his past. But there is another aspect of it, no less important: the danger of man's separating himself from his fellows of the past is concomitant—and almost identical—with the danger of his separating himself from his contemporaries. The problem is that of the individualism of our age, of our stress on liberty; how does this stress affect the social order, and what does education have to do with it?

Certain aspects of individualism are always publicized: in general, the belief that social and political institutions exist to better the life of the individual; a pattern of public life designed to check coercion and the insolence of office; the provision of diverse agencies for bringing into play every man's potentialities ("equality of opportunity"¹); the conviction that individual intuitions may improve on group conventions or official fiat and hence should have free expression. Naturally, democrats approve devices to check oppression and to render man's thoughts and his other abilities most productive.²

But there is an aspect of individualism which receives practically no attention—a danger growing out of its very nature. For to stress the individual means to set in motion a force which, unless

¹ In passing we may inquire the precise educational meaning of the term. Can anyone who desires be a physician? Or a metaphysician? A materialistic age gives inconsistent answers: it wants good bone-setting but doesn't care about bad mind-setting (an age that takes physic for all ills when its bilious state demands metaphysic—a spiritual purgation). Does equality of opportunity mean the elective system? Ironically, of course, the "system" strengthens the law of laziness, by which students deprive themselves of equality of opportunity. Actually, less of the elective system might mean better democracy.

² They ought to be aware, of course, of the ironic malfunctioning of these devices: for instance, the protection of "the concentration of economic power" by cries against "interference"; the disproportionate effectiveness of pressure groups that in exercising their "rights" interfere with the "rights" of others. In the world of ideas, a shallow conformity is often the greatest virtue. Actually, too, we are more likely to be hospitable to the spurious individualism of "I'm to do and get what I please" than to that of the critic who opposes mass delusions in order that society may survive.

counterchecked, leads to disintegration; individualism automatically tends to destroy cohesive forces, for we cannot—or at least do not—simultaneously stress the individual and the group. Just as in fascistic and totalitarian orders the tendency is necessarily toward the destruction of the individual, so in a libertarian order the logical course is toward the destruction of the social whole. Freedom, the closer it approaches absoluteness, threatens social cohesion the more—especially in our materialistic society, where the restraining values, being intangible, are very weak to begin with (wartime phenomena indicate that they can be revived, at least momentarily).

The problem of individualism, then, is preserving its benefits and yet checking the force driving toward chaos; it is our specific form of the eternal need to mediate between enslaving man and letting him run wild.

The specific function of education, in turn, is so to employ its characteristic materials and processes as to counterbalance the disintegrative tendency of individualism.¹ The responsibility and discipline required of men who are "free" but must live together, for instance, cannot be nourished on handouts and habit-forming intoxicants—the scholastic medicine easy to take, the courses promising quick profits. Catering is not education; it encourages profit-hunting instead of equipping men with a set of values that throw private gain into perspective. So, when J. D. Russell defines, "as a most important goal" of democracy, "the development of the individual and his potentialities," it is clear that he goes only halfway and that he ought to consider the complementary importance to democracy of Mr. Hutchins' "Let us find what is good for all and give them that." By what is good for all are all held together.

Men are not held together, again, by educational methods based on the elective system, a symbol of disintegration so clear that more than one Chicago Educator understands it (you can, of course, condemn heresy and still be a heretic). Nor by restricted vocational training or the provision of half a hundred skills de-

¹ Various means of holding men together are outside or only partly within the province of education—some aspects of the imaginative and emotional, and the religious. The vaster territory of "faith" is not the business of the present paper.

signed to slip youth quickly into our money-making machinery—which, as *substitutes* for the teaching of a body of knowledge, are destructive in their failure to transmit the common possessions in terms of which men survive. Nor by any concessions to a materialistic order (education's dollar-diplomacy), of its nature self-destructive. Nor by curricular devotion to the present ("obsolescent information") or to an undifferentiated past (obsolete information—the playground of "scholars"), both of which fail to achieve perspective or synthesis. The conflict in loyalties which we must recognize and deal with is unknowingly summarized by a "commerce" teacher distinguishing a colleague from himself: "He thinks we ought to reform business: I think we ought to get people ready for business."

And the irony of it is that though it may seem most "democratic" to "get people ready for business," it is actually in the end dangerous for democracy, for our business tradition is one of every man for himself, and devil take the hindmost—individualism of the most destructive sort.

Men must be got ready for life before business—a life that they can continue to live in common. Community they achieve momentarily in wartime, and in peace partially through moral equivalents of war. But elections and civic battles and crusades are excitements of but casual appeal; men must get on with each other not only in periodic strivings which call forth common efforts but in permanent association more deeply grounded. So it is the common heritage, the common experiences and ideals, that are the primary field of education: man's history, his arts and sciences and ideas. Democracy can survive only among men so nourished, so provided with a basis of unity in a world where all the major emphases drive them apart (in undemocratic nations, of course, or even in other democracies, there are other principles of order). Both their well-being and their survival require that they be subject, to borrow a word from Coleridge, to an esemplastic power. That is their fundamental need (in contrast with the "needs" adduced by Educators to rationalize fanciful digressions from education).

In a democracy it is *not* the function of education to give people what they want, nor is the solution to our ills to give "Education"

only to the few for whom there is room on social and economic peaks. People very frequently need what they do not want, and for democracy's sake it might even be advisable to give them something "undemocratic"—like Latin grammar. And education is not a social lubricant, an open sesame to wealth, a rainbow road, or a nostrum for neuroses: it is a hard discipline in a common and enduring way of life, and the more numerous the people subjected to it, beginning at an early age and continuing as long as possible, the better.

Louisiana State University

ROBERT B. HEILMAN

EDITORIAL

THE SPECIAL SIGNIFICANCE OF ASSOCIATION MEMBERSHIP IN WARTIME

Many of the younger members of the Association are now or soon will be enrolled in the armed services of the country. Some of these, because of financial necessity, have requested the suspension of their membership for the period of the war. Other members of the Association are now on leaves of absence engaged in appropriate war work. Some of these also have requested suspension of their membership until they return to their regular academic posts. During the war years a large number of young men and women who normally would enter the academic profession will instead enter the military or other services of the nation, thus diminishing the number of those who might have been expected to become members of the Association. The uncertainties of the future and the increase in the cost of living, combined with constant calls for contributions to worthy causes and subscriptions to government loans, may induce some members of the Association to ask whether the \$4.00 set aside for annual dues to the Association could not during the emergency be expended for a better purpose. We do well, therefore, to consider carefully the significance at this time of membership in our Association.

That the war adds to the difficulties, the uncertainties, and also to the obligations of those responsible for the conduct of higher education needs no elaboration. Students are under urgent necessity to secure as rapidly as possible the training that will best fit them for useful rôles in the service of the nation. Administrative officers and faculties must, therefore, adapt the instructional programs of institutions of higher education to the needs of the emergency without departing any more than necessary from the purposes for which these institutions were established and are maintained. Members of the faculties have the additional obligation to fit themselves into the extraordinary needs of the country and to offer themselves for services for which they are best quali-

fied and in which they can be most useful. These adjustments made necessary by the war call for educational statesmanship of the highest order in the achievement of which college and university teachers have a collective responsibility which they must not evade.

The responsible executives of institutions of higher learning are to be commended for their promptness in making it clear to the government that all the resources of these institutions are available to the nation for any services for which they are suited. This patriotic offer, however, involves some risks. A danger which has already been revealed is that the most valuable resources of the institutions, namely their faculties, may suffer from hasty decisions made without due regard for the proper interest of the teachers concerned and without adding substantially to the public welfare. Unfortunately, in making hurried changes in the instructional programs and administration of institutions normally governed in a considerable measure by custom and tradition, there is grave danger that injustices may occur or damage be done which not only is not necessary for the common good but is easily avoidable if all the factors are considered. Such injustices frequently affect persons who as individuals are powerless to obtain a remedy.

The best way to minimize the possibility of injustice is for all the parties concerned with proposed changes to be represented in the discussions preliminary to a decision. The officers of the American Association of University Professors have been invited to participate in such discussions and are undertaking to serve the profession in this manner. It is also important to make sure that changes when decided upon do not entail unnecessary burdens upon some individuals. Particularly is it important that changes made in the emergency not be used as a means of effecting results inspired by circumstances not connected with the national crisis. Enough complaints have already come to the attention of the officers of the Association to make it evident that cases of this kind will call for more time and more attention than are now available.

We face, therefore, the possibility that the membership of the Association may decline at the very time when the services which the Association renders to the profession are most needed.

The weight with which the Association speaks in educational discussions and acts in behalf of the profession depends in no small degree upon the size of its membership as compared with the total number of members of college and university faculties. Each additional member of the Association adds definitely to its strength and its influence in behalf of the causes which it supports. The effectiveness of the representatives of the Association when intervening in specific situations or when seeking to adjust individual complaints depends both on the size of the membership and the revenues which thereby accrue, for these enable the Association to maintain an adequate staff in the general office and to support the work of the necessary committees. During these crucial years it is particularly important, therefore, that all members of the Association who remain in the services of their institutions or who hold wartime positions while on leave of absence should keep up their membership, even though doing so may involve some sacrifice. In addition, it is important that we exert ourselves now as never before to explain to our nonmember colleagues who may not have understood the work of the Association the advantages that would accrue both to themselves and to the profession if they would give it their support.

War entails uncertainties, dangers, and sacrifices for all persons, but special ones for teachers and investigators. They are engaged in an undertaking whose nature and significance are not generally or fully understood. Whether the process of higher education is carried on wisely during the present crisis and in the reconstruction years will, to a large extent, determine the wisdom and the insight with which the post-war generations will be prepared to meet their new and basic problems. This situation demands that college and university teachers be more than specialists. They must have the insight into the whole of higher education which this Association helps to provide. In this connection it is appropriate to recall that the American Association of University Professors came into existence during the First World War. Although then in its infancy, the Association was a significant influence in educational affairs during that war and in the period of adjustment which followed. Experience has demonstrated that the most effective way for teachers and investigators to bring their influence to

bear on the problems of higher education as a whole is to maintain a strong professional association through which to speak and to act in behalf of the causes we exist to serve.

We hope that the members and the chapters of the Association will make special efforts during the war years to maintain and increase the membership of the Association to the end that there may be no diminution in the effectiveness of its work.

W. T. LAPRADE, *President*

RALPH E. HIMSTEAD, *General Secretary*

Censured Administrations

Investigations by the American Association of University Professors of the administrations of the several institutions listed below show that they are not observing the generally recognized principles of academic freedom and tenure, endorsed by this Association, the Association of American Colleges, the Association of American Law Schools, and the American Association of Teachers Colleges.

Placing the name of an institution on this list does not mean that censure is visited by this Association either upon the whole of that institution or upon the faculty, but specifically upon its present administration. This procedure does not affect the eligibility of non-members for membership in the Association, nor does it affect the individual rights of our members at the institution in question, nor do members of the Association who accept positions on the faculty of an institution whose administration is thus censured forfeit their membership. This list is published for the sole purpose of informing our members, the profession at large, and the public that unsatisfactory conditions of academic freedom and tenure have been found to prevail at these institutions. Names are placed on or removed from this censured list only by vote of the Association's Annual Meeting.

The censured administrations together with the dates of these actions by the Annual Meeting are listed below. Reports of investigations were published as indicated by the *Bulletin* citations:

Adelphi College, Garden City, New York (October, 1941 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 494-517)	December, 1941
Brenau College, Gainesville, Georgia	December, 1933
John B. Stetson University, De Land, Florida (October, 1939 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 377-399)	December, 1939
University of Kansas City, Kansas City, Missouri (October, 1941 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 478-493)	December, 1941
Montana State University, Missoula, Montana (<i>Bulletin</i> , April, 1938, pp. 321-348; December, 1939, pp. 578-584; February, 1940, pp. 73-91; December, 1940, pp. 602-606)	December, 1939
West Chester State Teachers College, West Chester, Pennsylvania (February, 1939 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 44-72)	December, 1939
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (March, 1935 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 224-266)	December, 1935
St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri (December, 1939 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 514-535)	December, 1939
University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee (June, 1939 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 310-319)	December, 1939
Central Washington College of Education, Ellensburg, Washington (October, 1940 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 471-475)	December, 1940
Western Washington College of Education (Board of Trustees), Bellingham, Washington (February, 1941 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 48-60)	December, 1941

MEMBERSHIP

Membership in the American Association of University Professors is open to all college and university teachers from the faculties of eligible institutions and to graduate students and graduate assistants. The list of eligible institutions is based primarily on the accredited lists of the established accrediting agencies subject to modification by action of the Association. Election to membership is by the Committee on Admission of Members following nomination by one Active Member of the Association who need not be on the faculty of the same institution as the nominee. Election cannot take place until thirty days after the nomination is published in the *Bulletin*. Nomination forms, circulars of information, and other information concerning the Association may be procured by writing to the General Secretary, 1155 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

(a) *Active*. To become an Active Member, it is necessary to hold a position of teaching or research with the rank of instructor or higher in an eligible institution and be devoting at least half time to teaching or research. Annual dues are \$4.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

(b) *Junior*. Junior membership is open to persons who are, or within the past five years have been, graduate students in eligible institutions. Junior Members are transferred to Active membership as soon as they become eligible. Annual dues are \$3.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

(c) *Associate*. Associate Members include those members who, ceasing to be eligible for Active or Junior membership because their work has become primarily administrative, are transferred to the Associate list with the approval of the Council. Annual dues are \$3.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

(d) *Emeritus*. Any Active Member retiring for age from a position in teaching or research may be transferred, at his own request and with the approval of the Council, to Emeritus membership. Emeritus members pay no dues but may if they desire receive the *Bulletin*, at \$1.00 a year.

(e) *Life Membership*. The Treasurer is authorized by the Council to receive applications from Active, Junior, and Associate

Members for Life membership, the amount to be determined in each case on an actuarial basis. This includes a life subscription to the *Bulletin*.

Nominations for Membership

The following 100 nominations for Active membership and 3 nominations for Junior membership are printed as provided by the Constitution. In accordance with action by the Council, objections to any nominee may be addressed to the General Secretary, who will in turn transmit them for the consideration of the Committee on Admission of Members if received within thirty days after this publication. The Council of the Association has ruled that the primary purpose of this provision for protests is to bring to the attention of the Committee any question concerning the technical eligibility of the nominee for membership as provided in the Constitution.

The Committee on Admission of Members consists of Professors Ella Lonn, Goucher College, *Chairman*; B. W. Kunkel, Lafayette College; A. Richards, University of Oklahoma; R. H. Shryock, University of Pennsylvania; W. O. Sypherd, University of Delaware; and F. J. Tschan, Pennsylvania State College.

Active

University of Alabama, Johnstone Parr, Derso S. Shybekay; Alma College, Charles D. Brokenshire; University of California (Berkeley), Willard F. Libby; University of California (Los Angeles), David McDonald; Centenary College of Louisiana, Mary F. Smith; Christian College, Paul Davee; University of Cincinnati, John F. Kahles; The City College (New York), Nicholas L. Deak, Sidney Ditzion; Coe College, Ethel Ryan; Colgate University, W. Emerson Reck, Stanley Wilcox; Teachers College of Connecticut, Richard L. Wampler; Cornell University, Stuart M. Brown, Jr.; Dartmouth College, Alvin L. Pianca; University of Dayton, Harry J. Rougier; Emory University, J. Harvey Young; Fresno State College, Charles N. Beard; Hamilton College, Frank H. Ristine; Haverford College, René Blanc-Roos, Emmett Dunn, Omar Pancoast, Jr.; Hunter College, Grace J. Calder, M. Elizabeth Clark, Kathryn M. Daly, Pearce Davis, Heinrich Hoeniger, Raymond Mandra, Isabel E. Rathborne; Indiana University, Leo Dowling, Roger W. Shugg, Brooks Smeeton; Iowa State College, Wilbur C. Nelson; State University of Iowa, Charles H. Foster; Kalamazoo College, Willis F. Dunbar; Kansas State College, B. R. Patterson; Fort Hays Kansas State College, Hobart S. Davis, Thelma I. De Forest, Wil-

liam H. Miller; Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia, Olive G. Phelps; Kemper Military School, Robert W. Earle; Louisiana College, Isabelle Johnson; University of Maryland, Catherine Barr, Curry N. Caples, Katherine Ward; Michigan State College, Frank Mannheimer, Townsend Rich, Elizabeth Walbert, Lester F. Wolterink; Mississippi State College for Women, R. John Rath; College of Mount St. Vincent, Susan Martin; Multnomah College, Carl A. Keeler, Martha F. McKeown, Katherine F. Murphy; New York Medical College, David Scherf; New York University, Pliny H. Powers; North Carolina College for Negroes, Joseph H. Taylor; East Carolina Teachers College (North Carolina), Hubert C. Haynes, E. L. Henderson; University of North Carolina, Nathan Rosen; University of North Dakota, Arthur W. Gill, Walter E. Kaloupek; University of Oregon, Pierre Van Rysselberghe, Willis C. Warren; Pennsylvania State College, Joseph R. Hilgert, Norbert J. Kreidl, Gilma Olson, Paul J. Reber, C. G. Vandegrift, Robert L. Weber; Pennsylvania State Teachers College (Millersville), Arthur R. Gerhart; University of Pittsburgh, Dorothy McMurry, Buell B. Whitehill, Jr.; Purdue University, Marion L. Mattson; Ricker Junior College, Mary Goins; Rutgers University, Oscar Lassner; San Angelo College, Mary Rountree; San Mateo Junior College, Robert R. Scidmore; Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, Carl W. Files, Clinton M. Kelley, Dial F. Martin; University of Texas, Willard R. Cooke, Delmar R. Gard, Jesse Johnson, William L. Marr, Loyd W. Sheckles, Jr., Henry H. Sweets, Jr., Clarence S. Sykes, Jarrett E. Williams; Utah State Agricultural College, William W. Henderson, Milton R. Merrill; University of Utah, Stephen C. Tornay; University of Washington, Clark Kerr; Wayne University, Raymond Miller; Westminster College (Pennsylvania), Carroll Leeds; West Virginia Wesleyan College, Ralph C. Brown, Oscar D. Lambert, Harold G. Steele; Yale University, George L. Trager.

Junior

Columbia University, Edward G. Hartmann; Not in Accredited Institutional Connection, George W. Bond (Ed.D., Columbia University), Hammond, La.; Kathryn H. Burkart (Ph.D., University of Pittsburgh), Pittsburgh, Pa.

Members Elected

The Committee on Admission of Members announces the election of 173 Active and 6 Junior Members as follows:

Active

University of Alabama, Harry M. Campbell, Thomas N. McVay; Allegheny College, Henry S. Dyer; University of Arkansas, Isabella C. Wilson; Bates College, Paul R. Sweet; Bowling Green State University, Myrtle Jensen,

Merrill C. McEwen; **Bradley Polytechnic Institute**, Ida K. Schmidt, Halsey Stevens, Harold Tarkow; **University of California (Los Angeles)**, James Gilluly; **Centenary College**, William Schuhle, Jr.; **The City College (New York)**, William R. Gondin, Julius A. Kuck; **Coker College**, Charles N. Sisson, Virgil Smith, Dwight Steere; **Colgate University**, Elbert W. Burr; **Colorado State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts**, Max E. Tyler; **Connecticut College**, William H. Carter, Jr.; **University of Connecticut**, William R. Clark, Neal F. Doubleday; **Cornell University**, Richard T. Gore; **University of Delaware**, Anna J. De Armond, Margaret Kellogg, David K. Spiegel; **Drake University**, Pearl C. Bjork, Alfred T. DeGroot; **Duke University**, Henry Bruinsma; **Ferris Institute (College of Pharmacy)**, Howard Hopkins; **Fordham University (Manhattan)**, George H. Owen; **Georgia School of Technology**, Graves H. Wilson; **Grinnell College**, James F. West; **Hamilton College**, Francis L. Patton; **University of Hawaii**, Bruce White; **Illinois Institute of Technology**, Jesse E. Hobson, Max Jakob, Marie W. Spencer, Friedrich K. Richter, Alvin Whitehill; **Western Illinois State Teachers College**, Carl L. Nelson; **Indiana State Teachers College**, Wilbur B. Brookover; **Indiana University**, Montana L. Grinstead; **State University of Iowa**, Theodore L. Jahn, Harold H. McCarty; **Kansas State College**, Arthur B. Sperry, Verne S. Sweedlun; **Fort Hays Kansas State College**, Vernon T. Clover, Pearl G. Cruise, Emma B. Golden, Roy Rankin, Paul T. Scott, Leonard Thompson; **Kansas State Teachers College (Emporia)**, Florence G. Davis, Adeline Wipf; **Kansas State Teachers College (Pittsburg)**, Virginia McAllister; **Kent State University**, James N. Holm; **Kenyon College**, Richard G. Salomon; **Lawrence College**, Eunice W. Clark, William F. Read; **Lincoln University**, Louis E. Fry; **Lindenwood College**, Fern E. Staggs; **Louisiana State University**, Janet Agnew, George Foster; **Madison College**, Helen M. Frank; **Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart**, Margaret B. Rheinberger; **Mary Washington College**, W. Edwin Hemphill, Earl Nicks; **Michigan State College**, Richard G. Horton, Wilbur F. Luick, J. A. Strelzoff; **University of Michigan**, John W. Riegel; **Mills College**, Darius Milhaud; **University of New Hampshire**, Herbert A. Carroll; **University of New Mexico**, Frank H. Jonas, Gene T. Pelsor; **New York Medical College**, Lindsley F. Cocheu, Margaret Hotchkiss, Lois Lillick, Andrea Saccone; **New York University**, Charles Haubiel, Robert M. Herbst, John M. Labberton; **North Carolina College for Negroes**, W. Edward Farrison, Lawrence Knox, William H. Robinson; **University of North Dakota**, Willard E. Davenport; **Northwestern University**, William Balamuth, Margery C. Carlson, Electa A.-Gamron, Daniel R. Lang, Merhyle F. Spotts; **Occidental College**, Charles K. Alexander; **University of Oklahoma**, Samuel Silver; **University of Omaha**, Leslie Garlough, Robert W. Starring; **University of Oregon**, Wesley C. Ballaine, Frederick M. Combellack, Arnold Elston, Hoyt C. Franchere, Maude Garnett, Rose E. McGrew, Sigurd Nilssen, Hugh M. Shafer; **Pennsylvania State College**, Louis J. Bradford, John Carlock, Ellwood B. Cassel, George L. Guillet, Sylvain J. Pirson, Arthur H. Reede, Leland S. Rhodes, Frederick Stewart, Lindsey W. Whitehead; **Pennsylvania State Teachers College (Millersville)**, Raymond S. Hovis; **University of Pennsylvania**,

William E. Arnold; **University of Pittsburgh**, Wilmer E. Baldwin, Charles R. Crow, Jr., William R. Grove, Louis W. H. Johnston, Charles W. Lomas, John W. May, Frederick P. Mayer, John W. Oliver, Edwin L. Peterson, Francis J. Putman, Hurd W. Safford, Charles P. Scott, Surain S. Sidhu, Warren W. D. Sones, J. Paul Watson; **Queens College (New York)**, Phillips Bradley, Charles F. Gosnell, Esther K. Sheldon; **University of Redlands**, Olive M. Sarber; **Princeton University**, Cyril E. Black, George A. Graham, Eugene Pacsu, Stow S. Persons, William Ringler; **San Angelo College**, Rose S. Brewer, John S. Spratt; **San Bernardino Valley Junior College**, Edna Storr; **San Francisco State College**, Ruth R. Baker; **Texas College of Arts and Industries**, John E. Conner; **University of Toledo**, Densil Cooper, Arnold W. Lapp, Raymond Lavalley, Jesse R. Long, Erman O. Scott; **Tulane University**, Gerald M. Capers, Jr., Robert D. Field, Heinz Thannhauser; **Utah State Agricultural College**, Ruth M. Bell, King Hendricks, Evan Murray, William N. Watson; **Medical College of Virginia**, Clair R. Spealman; **Virginia State College for Negroes**, Charles J. Wartman, Jr.; **Wabash College**, Byron K. Trippet; **Western Washington College of Education**, Paul R. Grim; **Wayne University**, William J. Bossenbrook, D. Clarence Morrow, Harold O. Soderquist, Jane B. Welling; **West Virginia Wesleyan College**, Lewis H. Chrisman, Arthur A. Schoolcraft; **Willamette University**, Robert E. Lantz, Robert H. Tschudy; **Winthrop College**, H. L. Frick, Gerald Langford, Crystal Theodore, Jack McL. Watson; **Yale University**, Julian J. Obermann.

Transfer from Junior to Active

Arizona State Teachers College (Tempe), Donald R. Van Petten.

Junior

University of Connecticut, Clarence J. Miller; **Iowa State College**, Elizabeth Fautz, Alonzo M. Myster; **Princeton University**, Milford S. Loughheed; **Not in Accredited Institutional Connection**, John C. Matthews (Ph.D., University of Virginia), Bristol, Tenn.; Jennie Sofejko (M.S., Columbia University), Cortland, N. Y.

Academic Vacancies and Teachers Available

The Association is glad to render service to appointing officers and teachers by publishing the information below. The officers of the Association can, however, take no responsibility for maintaining a register or for making a selection among applicants. It is optional with the appointing officer or the applicant to publish the address in the announcement or to use a key number. In the latter case those interested should send their letters of application to the General Secretary, American Association of University Professors, 1155 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Teachers Available

Chemistry: Man, 43, married, 3 children, Ph.D. Sixteen years' experience in teaching analytical chemistry. Author of successful textbook and numerous papers. Also some experience in general and organic chemistry. Desires change. A 2037

Chemistry: Physical chemist, Ph.D., with teaching experience in inorganic chemistry and research in insecticides and fertilizers, publications and patents; desires teaching or research position. A 2038

Classical Philology, Archaeology, History, Modern Languages: Man, Ph.D., 34, married, draft deferred. University and Museum administrative and lecture experience. European travel, publications. A 2039

French and German: Woman, Docteur d' Université, high school and college experience. Now on sabbatical leave. A 2040

History and Political Science: Man, 56, married, Ph.D. Native American. 18 years of college teaching. Experience in administration and student relations. Speaking engagements. Publications: outline to accompany history texts. Now employed in state university. A 2041

A LOW-COST ILLUSTRATION

10-Year Term Insurance

Disability Waiver of Premium Included

At Age	Annual Premium Per \$1,000 Insurance	First Year Cash Dividends*
25	\$ 7.66	\$2.34
35	\$ 9.06	\$2.15
45	\$14.84	\$2.64

* 1942 Dividend Scale. Dividends, while not guaranteed, have been paid every year.

Term Insurance fits only temporary needs. Rates and descriptions of *all* policies offered will be sent on request. You must take the initiative. We have no agents; the saving goes to you.

TEACHERS INSURANCE AND ANNUITY ASSOCIATION

522 Fifth Avenue

New York

Created and Endowed to Serve the Educational World

OUTSTANDING PUBLICATIONS ON

THE AMERICAN COLLEGE

Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges, edited by Guy E. Snavelly. Issued four times a year. \$3.00.

American Education and World Responsibility—The Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual Meeting, 1942. Addresses by Malcolm MacDonald, H. W. Prentis, Jr., George N. Shuster. Additional articles by Paul V. McNutt, Isaiah Bowman and Guy E. Snavelly. Annual Reports, Minutes, Membership, Constitution. (*Bulletin*, March, 1942.) \$1.50.

The American Colleges and the Social Order by Robert Lincoln Kelly. An interpretative and critical study of the development of American colleges and college education which gives new perspective to the much discussed problems of higher education today. The Macmillan Company, New York. \$2.50.

Teaching with Books—A Study of College Libraries by Harvie Branscomb. Association of American Colleges, New York, and American Library Association, Chicago. \$2.50.

Comprehensive Examinations in the Humanities by Edward Safford Jones. Questions used in senior terminal examinations in the classics, English, modern languages, philosophy, art. Single copy, \$1.25; ten copies, \$10.00.

Comprehensive Examinations in American Colleges by Edward Safford Jones. 434 pages \$2.50.

College Music by Randall Thompson. Report of an investigation of non-professional offerings in typical selected institutions under a subvention from the Carnegie Corporation. The Macmillan Company, New York. \$2.50.

Orders for the above publications may be sent to the

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

The
BULLETIN

**American Association
of
University Professors**

AN EDUCATIONAL JOURNAL by teachers and investigators presenting articles and reports of concern to all who are interested in or a part of our institutions of higher learning. Current subjects: higher education and the war; educational programs and policies; faculty-administration relations; freedom of inquiry and expression; tenure; the evaluation of faculty services; professional ethics.

Published bimonthly during the academic year: February, April, June, October, and December. Circulation 15,000.

Subscription \$3.00 a year

American Association of University Professors
1155 Sixteenth Street, N. W. Washington, D. C.

**Journal of Higher
Education**

THE MAGAZINE FOR
LEADERS IN COLLEGIATE
EDUCATION

Subscription \$3 a year

**OHIO STATE
UNIVERSITY**

COLUMBUS

For the past twelve years the Journal has been recognized as the leading magazine devoted to matters pertaining to the different areas of higher education. The contents of each issue are varied. The prospectus for the year's issues contains discursive articles, reports of research, and criticisms of current practices. We believe that professors and administrative officers, when once subscribers to the Journal, will find it so satisfying that they will not wish to be without it.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS ON JUNIOR COLLEGES

The Literature of Junior College Terminal Education

By LOIS E. ENGLEMAN and WALTER C. EELLS. Contains more than 1,500 abstracts of articles, bulletins, and theses. Carefully classified and fully indexed. 336 pages. *\$2.50 per volume.*

Present Status of Junior College Terminal Education

By WALTER C. EELLS, BYRON S. HOLLINSHEAD, EDWARD F. MASON and MAX SCHIFERL. Summary of nation-wide investigation on the status of terminal education in more than 400 junior colleges. Copiously illustrated. 350 pages. *\$2.50 per volume.*

Why Junior College Terminal Education?

By WALTER C. EELLS, JOHN W. HARBESON, EDWARD F. MASON, NICHOLAS RICCIARDI, WILLIAM H. SNYDER, and GEORGE F. ZOOK. An analysis of vital economic, social, and educational factors and summary of judgments of almost 2,000 educators and laymen. 390 pages. *\$2.50 per volume.*

Associate's Degree and Graduation Practices in Junior Colleges

By WALTER C. EELLS. Comprehensive information on history and use of associate in arts and other associate's degrees in more than 250 junior colleges, senior colleges, and universities. Also considers the proposals for the bachelor's degree at the junior college level. 136 pages. *\$1.75 per volume.*

Junior College Journal

Only national periodical devoted exclusively to the rapidly expanding junior-college field. Nine issues, September to May. *\$3.00 per year.*

Complete list of publications on request

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES
730 JACKSON PLACE, WASHINGTON, D. C.